DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 268 95 SP 010 906

AUTHOR	Lewis, Lanora G.; And Others
TITLE	Talent and Tomorrow's Teachers: The Honors Approach. New Dimensions in Higher Education: Number 11.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	OE-50036
PUB DATE	63
NOTE	90p.; A statement based upon the verbatim transcript of proceedings of an April 1962 conference of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; Curriculum Problems; Educational Alternatives; Educational Problems; Financial Problems; High Achievers; *Honors Classes; Honors Curriculum; *Professional Education; *Program Development; Speeches; *Superior Students; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This publication presents an analytical summary of theories and problems of the honors approach in relation to programs for superior students who plan to enter the teaching profession. It describes some of the problems encountered with the establishment, operation, and evaluation of such programs, and suggests what their impact may be upon the quality emphasis in individual schools and in education as a whole. The proceedings transcripts upon which it is based are the verbatim account of the "Honors and the Preparation of Teachers" conference, April 8-10, 1962, held at the University of Wisconsin. Areas discussed include: the significance of honors programs for teacher education, their place in preparing elementary and secondary education majors, discussions of content, method, cooperation, selection procedures, guidance of participants, and program evaluation. The impact of honors programs on education in the schools is examined from the viewpoints of teacher recruitment and retention and program costs. Appendixes include the verbatim transcripts of five conference sessions and a list of participants. (MB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED137268

OE-50036

NEW DIMENSIONS
in Higher Education

Number 11

Talent and Tomorrow's Teachers

THE HONORS APPROACH

A statement based upon the verbatim transcript of proceedings of an April 1962 conference of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student; J. W. Cohen, Director, and N. D. Kurland, Associate Director, ICSS

by
Lanora G. Lewis, *Assistant Specialist,*
Programs for Superior Students,
Division of Higher Education

In cooperation with
J Ned Bryan, *Specialist for the Gifted and Talented,*
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education

and
Robert Poppendieck, *Specialist, Teacher Education,*
Division of Higher Education

SP 010 906

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Anthony J. Celebrezze, *Secretary*

Office of Education
Francis Keppel, *Commissioner*

New Dimensions in Higher Education

WINSLOW R. HATCH, *Coordinator of the Series* and *Director*, Clearinghouse of Studies on Higher Education

THE SERIES *New Dimensions in Higher Education* deals with developments of significance to colleges and universities and all persons interested in improving the quality of higher education. These developments are examined one at a time but in the context of a series. Each number is intended, within the bounds of reasonable brevity, to provide the hurried reader with a summary and interpretation of a substantial body of information. To the extent feasible, detailed studies are cited, needed additional research is identified, and recommendations are suggested. Background materials include reports on file in the Office of Education's Clearinghouse of Studies on Higher Education, published literature in the field, and the counsel of educators who are recognized authorities in the subjects treated. In order that the series may be increasingly useful to colleges and universities, reader reactions are welcome.

A detailed listing of previous numbers of the series appears inside the back cover.

Printed 1963
Reprinted 1966

Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. FS 5.250 : 50036

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1966

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C. - Price 35 cents

Highlights

1. Honors programs serve a dual purpose in relation to teacher education. They provide a type of approach which attracts and is appropriate for superior students; at the same time, they can give teacher candidates the kinds of effective learning experiences on which they may capitalize later in their work with talented students in the schools.
2. Cooperative planning by the faculty of subject disciplines and those of professional education contributes to fertile exploration of the content, methods, and ends of education. This can result in a close functional relationship between teachers of the arts and sciences and teachers of education as they seek those methods which enhance and enrich the learning experience and cause the student to handle the content with which he is dealing in a more efficient manner.
3. In planning programs for students who progress at a rate and depth greater than that of average students, the partnership among teachers at the various levels of the educational continuum provides improved insights into teaching-learning situations and understanding of practices of flexible progression. At the same time, it provides necessary background for effective advising of students.
4. To accommodate differences in learning rate and depth, new measures of accomplishment are needed. Furthermore, certification requirements could well be modified in some States to guarantee quality without imposing unnecessary restrictions through formal course requirements.
5. Honors programs have been and will continue to be proving grounds for many of the emerging practices through which teaching-learning experiences of all students are being improved. Judicious provision of honors programs at all levels of the educational continuum can not only make it possible to nurture the talents of superior students wherever and whenever they can be identified but can also contribute to improvement of regular programs as well.

Contents

Page

FOREWORD v

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. HONORS—THEIR PLACE IN THE QUEST FOR QUALITY 5

III. HONORS AND THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS 8

Significance for Teacher Education 8

Honors in Professional Education Programs 13

Elementary and Secondary Education Majors 14

Student Teaching 18

Problems and Promise 21

Content v. *Method* 23

Climates of Cooperation: Articulation, Integration, Coordination 24

Selection of Honors Students 27

Staffing and Financing Honors Programs 30

Guidance and Placement 31

Evaluation of Programs 36

IV. IMPACT OF HONORS ON EDUCATION IN THE SCHOOLS 38

The Quality Emphasis, Its Implications 39

Effect of Honors Programs on Recruitment and Retention of Teachers 44

Economic Implications 45

V. CONCLUSIONS 47

APPENDIX A. CONFERENCE ADDRESSES

Between the Conception and the Act by *E. W. Strong* 53

The Threat of Honors by *James L. Jarrett* 61

Oases of Excellence by *Lindley Stiles* 65

Conference Reflections by *J. W. Maucker* 70

Appendix B. On Honors in Practice Teaching 74

Appendix C. Conference Participants and Executive Committee and Staff of ICSS 80

Foreword

THE HONORS approach is characterized by rigorous inquiry involving students and teachers with exceptional intellectual commitments and ability. This climate of learning encompasses the excitement of bright minds in contact with bright minds, working on matters of importance, generally in small groups and often making use of independent study. It encourages maximum development of exceptional ability and talent wherever it can be identified—at all levels of the educational continuum and among the socially disadvantaged as well as among those more fortunate. As a result of this approach to learning, a renaissance in American education may be underway.

This issue of the New Dimensions Series explores the potentialities of honors programs and of the honors approach in relation to high ability students who are preparing to teach. While there is no claim that honors is the only approach to the preparation of these teachers, it is recognized that honors programs in general are distinguished by the breadth, depth, and sense of inquiry which are considered important elements in working successfully with students whose intellectual and creative talents transcend the average. In programs of teacher preparation, therefore, the honors approach to learning may have a leavening effect which reaches the whole educational enterprise and helps to lead each individual, of whatever capacity, to seek the maximum development of his talents.

Programs specifically identified as *honors programs* have been in use in colleges and universities for more than 30 years. Since 1958, the body of theory and practice relative to these programs has been clarified and publicized through the efforts of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student. In April 1962, under the sponsorship of ICSS, a national conference on *Honors and the Preparation of Teachers* was convened at the University of Wisconsin to explore the significance of honors and the honors approach in teacher preparation. At the suggestion of former Commissioner Sterling M. McMurrin, the proceedings of that conference were submitted to the Office of Education by Joseph W. Cohen, Director, and N. D. Kurland, who was then Associate Director of ICSS.

From the verbatim report of the Wisconsin conference, this publication treats the interrelationships between honors in the arts and sciences and honors in the professional education of students who are preparing to teach. It describes some of the problems encountered in connection with the establishment, operation, and evaluation of honors programs, and suggests what the impact of these programs may be upon the quality emphasis in individual schools and hence upon the quality thrust in education as a whole.

The Office of Education has been pleased to cooperate in the preparation of this statement. The proceedings transcript on which it is based presents the views and arguments of a distinguished group of leaders in American education. Furthermore, the Office is particularly indebted to Professor Cohen and others of ICSS for providing introductory material, for substantial analysis of the verbatim proceedings, and for review of the final manuscript for accuracy of interpretation.

HAROLD A. HASWELL
Director, Programs Branch
Division of Higher Education

R. ORIN CORNETT
Acting Assistant Commissioner
for Higher Education

I. Introduction

> **Quite certainly the key to the quality of our entire educational enterprise is the intellectual strength of our teachers, their grasp of the aims and purposes of education, the quality of their own liberal education, and their competence in the subjects they teach. Without question the establishment of effective honors programs for selected potential teachers can have far-reaching consequences for our schools.—Sterling M. McMurrin, former *Commissioner of Education*[1]**

The honors approach to learning presumes not only an exceptional intellectual commitment on the part of the student but also the capacity, motivation, and sense of inquiry needed to pursue that commitment. This publication presents an analytical summary of theories and problems of the honors approach in relation to programs for superior students who plan to enter the teaching profession. It is based on proceedings of the conference on *Honors and the Preparation of Teachers*, sponsored by the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student, April 8–10, 1962, at the University of Wisconsin. This was the sixth major ICSS conference[2] and the first to concentrate on the problems of honors in a single professional field. It was generated out of a growing conviction that an honors approach to teacher preparation could better attract, hold, and prepare talented future teachers. There was also a conviction that an approach by way of honors could provide an extremely fertile basis for effective cooperation in common concerns between the professional discipline of education and the subject-matter disciplines of the liberal arts and sciences.

The transcript of proceedings included a verbatim record of 2 days of intensive plenary-session discussion by some 70 conferees, well divided between education and the liberal arts and representing 44 institutions and 7 national educational associations. A list of participants and their respective affiliations is given in appendix C.

---

[1] Statement prepared for this publication.

[2] Preceding conferences: Southern, November 1958 (University of Louisville); Eastern, June 1959 (University of Michigan); Negro, February 1960 (Southern University); Western, April 1960 (University of California); and Honors Directors, June 1961 (University of Colorado). The original conference out of which the ICSS was launched was held at the University of Colorado in June 1957 with the help of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. A grant from the Carnegie Corporation made possible the subsequent series of five conferences, and the Edgar Stern Family provided a grant for the conference on which this report is based.

The conference began with addresses by Edward W. Strong, Chancellor, University of California at Berkeley, and James L. Jarrett, President, Western Washington State College, representing, respectively, a comprehensive university and an institution which is still chiefly concerned with teacher education. After a day of panels and discussions, two further approaches were presented by Lindley Stiles, Dean, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, and J. W. Maucker, president, State College of Iowa. All of these addresses are included in appendix A of this report.

In the discussion periods, the conferees examined many theoretical and practical problems germane to the themes.[3] Out of the complete ICSS transcript, this report distills what seems to be the gist of the points of view of educators directly concerned with the preparation of teachers. There has been a deliberate effort to retain as much as possible of the actual verbatim proceedings, although materials have been re-arranged in a form useful for the reader confronting the problems of honors in education for the first time. Unless otherwise noted, quotations immediately following section heads are taken directly from the proceedings transcript. To avoid innumerable references, no attempt has been made to identify individual conferees responsible for other statements or ideas. The reader interested in the degree of conformity of the text to the proceedings transcript is invited to compare points in appendixes A and B with deliberate treatment of these points elsewhere in the report.

The basic recommendation of the Wisconsin conference was that institutions which prepare teachers should inaugurate honors programs for superior students. Coming from an ICSS conference, this conclusion was not surprising. It followed an exciting, effective, and spirited exchange of ideas among representatives of professional education and those of the arts and sciences. Many problems, to be sure, remain unresolved; but for each of them new avenues for cooperation were opened. More than anything else, the conference was directed toward factors related to the planning and implementation of programs that attract and prepare those who are the best qualified for teaching to become the best kind of teachers. To the extent that "nuclei of quality," recommended by J. W. Cohen, Director of ICSS, can be developed in teacher preparation, models may be provided for upgrading the entire professional sequence for teachers, thereby providing an opportunity for every student to make the progress of which he is capable. This could lead ultimately not only to better programs for superior students but also to the improvement of educational experiences for all students.

---

[3] Many of the themes having to do with honors programs generally have been treated in issues of the ICSS newsletter, *The Superior Student*. Back copies of most issues are available for a nominal charge from the ICSS office, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., and back issues are also available on microfilm from University microfilms. See the index issues (February 1961 and May–June 1962) for relevant articles under the following categories: Advanced Placement, Administration, Advising, All-University Programs, Budgeting, Education, Freshman Year—Beginning in, Freshman Programs and Courses, General Programs, General v. Departmental Honors, High School-College Liaison, Interdisciplinary Courses and Programs, Professional Schools, Research and Evaluation, Selection, Seminars and Colloquia, Teaching, Theory of Honors, and Women in Honors.

There is no single pattern characteristic of all honors programs. An institution starts one where feasible and then moves in the direction of a full program in terms of its interpretation of needs and its ability to implement plans. The ICSS, which has been largely responsible for development of the body of theory and practice relative to these programs, makes the following recommendations regarding the major features of a full honors program:

1. Identify and select students of higher ability as early as possible. This involves far closer cooperation than has hitherto been the case with high schools and preparatory schools. The proper uses of predictive techniques, past records, entrance tests and interviews, and studies of aptitude, motivation, and achievement are now being explored and much experience is being canvassed.
2. Start programs for these students immediately upon admission to the college or university and admit other superior students into these programs whenever they are later identified by their teachers.
3. Make such programs continuous and cumulative through all 4 years, with honors counseling especially organized and equally continuous.
4. Formulate such programs so that they will relate effectively both to all the college work for the degree and to the area of concentration, departmental specialization, preprofessional or professional training.
5. Make the progress varied and flexible by establishing special courses, ability sections, honors seminars, colloquia and independent study. Advanced placement and acceleration will serve in a contributory role.
6. Make the honors program increasingly visible throughout the institution so that it will provide standards and models of excellence for all students and faculty, and contribute to the substitution of an "honors outlook" for the "grade outlook."
7. Employ methods and materials appropriate to superior students. Experience has shown that this involves:
   a. Bringing the abler students together in small groups or classes of from 5 to 20 students.
   b. Using primary sources and original documents rather than textbooks where possible.
   c. Less lecturing and predigesting by the faculty of content to be covered; approaching selectively the subject matter to be covered;

discouraging passive note taking; encouraging student adventure with ideas in open discussion—the colloquium method with appropriate modification of this method in science and professional schools.

d. Supplementing the above with increased independent study, research and summer projects.

e. Continuous counseling, in the light of the individual student's development, by teaching personnel, not by full-time nonteaching counselors.

f. Giving terminal examinations to test the honors results.

8. Select faculty qualified to give the best intellectual leadership to able students and fully identified with the aims of the program.

9. Set aside, where possible, such requirements as are restrictive of a good student's progress, thus increasing his freedom among the alternative facets of the honors and regular curriculum.

10. Build in devices of evaluation to test both the means used and the ends sought by an honors program.

11. Establish a committee of honors students to serve as liaison with the honors committee or council. Keep them fully informed on the program and elicit their cooperation in evaluation and development.

12. Use good students wherever feasible as apprentices in teaching and as research assistants to outstanding faculty members.

13. Employ honors students for counseling, orientation and other academic advisory purposes in the general student body.

14. Establish where possible an honors center with honors library, lounge, reading rooms and other appropriate decor.

15. Assure that such programs will be permanent features of the curriculum and not dependent on temporary or spasmodic dedication of particular faculty or administrators—in other words, institutionalize such programs, budget them and build thereby a tradition of excellence.

II. Honors—Their Place in the Quest for Quality

> **The most talented students are capable of the best work. The sooner they are identified and provided with opportunity to make ample use of their talents as they mature, the more they will encompass and master in the years they spend in formal education. It is the aim of honors work to enable the best students to do the best of which they are capable.**
>
> • • •
>
> **Honors work is the work of inquiry to which teacher and student contribute. It fosters and develops skill in examining the answers given to questions by demanding evidence and reasons. It leads to examinations of the questions themselves and of the kinds of answers that are relevant to a scientific question, a moral or aesthetic question, a question about validity of reasoning, a question about truth or falsity of a proposition, a question about definition as distinguished from a question about causation, a question about facts and a question about interpretation of facts.—Edward W. Strong, *University of California***

Capabilities of good students may differ in degree and, in extreme cases, in kind. So, too, the intellectual fare of students in an honors program differs in degree and at times in kind from the fare of those who fall short of qualifying for honors. While there may be general agreement on the purpose of honors work, the ways and means of effectuating this purpose vary widely among institutions and among departments within institutions. In the *Honors Inventory, 1960–61*, a progress report and not an exhaustive survey, the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student lists programs and provisions in 4-year colleges and universities.[1]

---

[1] *The Superior Student*, the newsletter of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student, entire issue of January 1961. Included in the directory are 196 institutions with definite operating programs and 43 with proposed programs. The rapid spread of these programs in recent years is indicated by the fact that more than half of the operating programs were inaugurated since 1958. Many more programs have been started since January 1961.

In attempting to catalog the ways and means used by institutions to carry out their honors programs, the questionnaire used by ICSS listed and supplied explanations for the following specific provisions: Advising, student committee, advanced placement, credit by examination, requirements waived, special sections, special courses, theme groups, seminars, colloquia, independent study, tutorials, research projects, in-course projects, summer projects, comprehensive examinations, outside examiners, thesis, study abroad for honors credit, special privileges, honors center, graduate work for undergraduates, brochure, publications, and evaluation. A space was provided for giving details about additional provisions and future plans. An analysis of the inventory shows no set pattern, but half or more of the institutions indicated specific provisions for one or more of the following: independent study, senior thesis or research project, advanced placement, comprehensive examinations, requirements waived, and credit by examination. Some institutions indicated that their honors programs included virtually every provision on the list.

From a study of the complete file of *The Superior Student*, it seems safe to assume that in a given institution—indeed, even in a given course—the approach to honors work depends upon relative emphasis upon depth or breadth of study, acceleration or enrichment, knowledge or performance, purpose or level of experience, or combinations of these, according to the philosophy and resources of the particular institution. In other words, although the purpose of honors programs in general may be to provide the best possible education for the best students, the ways and means may be a compromise between what is desirable and what is feasible within the resources of the institution.

An honors program rests on qualitative discriminations not only in selection of particular modes of work but also in selection of students and in selection of faculty. Simple ability grouping is not enough for a true honors program if it does not differentiate the highly gifted student from the above average student. Only as this selection is made does one arive at the qualitative discrimination that sets off doing better with better students from doing the best with the best, the conception of honors to which many colleges and universities adhere in their honors programs. In any institution, there still is the problem of what to do in those cases where individual teachers identify students who have exceptional depth, independent intellectuality, and creativity, but who have not amassed the grade-point average recommended for honors work because they have let grades fall where they may while devoting time and effort to study that interests them most.

Whatever the position in which an institution finds itself in determining the capable students to whom it can properly devote special attention, effective honors work calls for teachers who have equipped themselves to challenge the minds of these students and to meet the challenge they present. If there is an honors program at the liberal arts college, the school of education should capitalize on it and arrange for students in the program to continue in honors, or else expect dissatisfaction from such students who choose careers in education.

There is another reason why schools of education should have honors programs, perhaps even if there is no such program in general education. Honors work that calls fully upon the intellectual resources of the student of exceptional ability develops in him a fuller capability to repeat the process with his students. Furthermore, it is reasonable to expect that experience with honors courses will strengthen interest of superior students in teaching, since honors work is the antithesis of a routine performance of routine chores. If those engaged in teacher preparation have not brought their own best qualified students into work of honors quality, they will not be furnishing a cadre of teachers who will be able to carry the conception of work of honors quality into the schools.

With the best students and the best teachers, breadth and depth of inquiry will thrive best. However, although such inquiry ought never to be conceived as something reserved for honors work or peculiar to it, it ought always to be characteristic of the work of students and teachers in honors programs. In the continuum of the educables and the educators, there is no point at which there is justification for treating learning as merely a matter of rote in turning out readymade answers to stock questions. Learning requires application and exacting practice. The ablest student may perform easily many tasks with which others have to struggle. On the other hand, a less gifted student, through greater labor, may accomplish more than his more gifted companion. If the gifted student fails to come up to expectations, the fault may lie within himself; on the other hand, it may lie with the school or with the teacher if too little was offered or demanded.

While advocating and furnishing equality of opportunity, our colleges and universities must also recognize inequality of capability and help the ablest students to advance as fast and as far as they can. There is no real incompatibility between the end of educating the many and that of providing the best for the best. The press of numbers need not be at the expense of quality, and we cannot afford to sacrifice one to the other.

III. Honors and the Preparation of Teachers

Significance for Teacher Education

> **The importance of honors programs for teachers derives from the fact that most people tend to teach as they have been taught. Thus the challenge to us is to give students the kind of experiences in college which we hope they will transmit to their students in the schools.—J Ned Bryan, *U.S. Office of Education***

Honors programs specifically designed for prospective teachers can become invitations to teaching to the most outstanding young people, those with the keenest minds and those with the greatest sense of commitment. They can also lead to improvement of teacher education itself.

The objective of honors programs for prospective teachers is twofold: first, to provide work that is intellectually exciting and challenging to bright students; and, second, to produce teachers who are personally and professionally prepared to carry the challenge of excellence into their own classrooms. Honors programs have to produce results, both while the student is in school and after he graduates.

To attain this twofold objective, those who would build honors programs for teachers must take a long look at the total honors program, not only at the program in education. To provide proper synchronization requires a high degree of cooperation on an institution-wide basis between professors of education and professors in other schools, particularly in the liberal arts. Fortunately, there are rapid strides in moving toward this kind of cooperation in many institutions. Within the last 5 years, over 200 institutions have introduced honors courses. Already about 20 of these are doing something about honors programs for teachers. This means that colleges and universities are beginning to add the dimension of honors to the pedagogical phase of teacher education.

Examples of the practical problems encountered by institutions already trying to involve prospective teachers in honors opportunities give some insight into the highly organic and creative way in which honors programs develop and grow. For example, at the University of Wisconsin,[1] where with the addition of the senior year in September 1962, the honors program in the arts college will be complete, there is a rather unusual interlocking faculty arrangement between the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education and an extremely strong sense of departmental autonomy and independence. This sort of arrangement could result in flexibility or anarchy, depending on how well groups work together on various mutual problems. For those professional schools that are to any substantial degree linked to an arts college, the center of gravity of honors work is in the arts college. In fact, most schools require a student to do honors work in the arts college before he is eligible for honors in the professional college. Once in the School of Education, the secondary major's honors work in his academic major is identical insofar as possible with the honors curriculum of an arts student in the same subject. The fact that the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences is also part of the faculty of the School of Education is considered an enormous advantage.

The honors program in the School of Education at Wisconsin is considered a pilot study that will help develop more adequate ways of handling superior students. Increasing attention has been given to the recruitment of superior faculty members in education. Last year, the first honors course—a course in the area of educational psychology—was in operation. By 1962–63, a number of additional courses are expected to be in operation in the professional sequence.

At the University of Illinois,[2] a study committee of the University Senate, set up in 1957, worked for a year to prepare a written constitution for an all-university honors program. It was based on the assumption that good students are to be found in every division; each of the major colleges at Illinois now has, in some form, a working honors program. Each year, in the all-university honors program, about 30 out of 250 honors freshmen are in the teacher-education program.

Within the College of Education at Illinois, there is no consensus about whether the best approach should be (1) primarily independent study with perhaps the preparation of a major research paper or thesis; (2) specially designated sections of undergraduate courses which cover the same ground that is covered in all sections but in more detail; (3) special sections of regular courses which have more freedom and do not necessarily cover the same material as other sections;[3] or (4) special honors courses which differ entirely from regular courses. At this point, the honors program in education is relatively new; and no definite approaches have been established. There is agreement, however, that the courses should be more analytical, the students more critical and inclined to go to original rather than secondary sources, and the instructors more inclined to help the students develop sophistication in terms of the cognitive structure of the field, its reigning ideas, and general theory.

---

[1] See the following articles and notes in *The Superior Student:* "Distinctive Features of the University of Wisconsin Honors Program," May–June 1960, p. 16; "Notes," March 1961, p. 29, and January–February 1962, p. 29.

[2] See the following articles in *The Superior Student:* "All-University Honors Program," January 1960, p. 9; "Two University of Illinois Professional School Programs," May–June 1960, p. 13; "All-University Honors Program," November–December 1961, p. 2; and "Student Attitudes Toward the Honors Program," January–February 1962, p. 11.

From the very beginning of the honors program at the University of Colorado[4] (1930), education and the arts and sciences have been involved in close cooperation. The founders agreed that all students—education students included—ought to have a strong liberal arts education. They stressed and fought for an honors approach, both in general studies and in the departments, the lower division work fortifying the upper division departmental requirements and the departmental work in the upper division influencing the work undertaken in the lower division. This emphasis has continued in spite of the fact that 3 years ago the Department of Education became a separate school which students enter as juniors. Many education students, however, continue to take liberal arts honors courses along with students majoring in other fields. They also have an opportunity to meet together in the honors center. A member of the School of Education faculty has nearly always been on the College of Arts and Sciences Honors Council.

At Colorado, it has been gratifying to note over the past few years that overall grade-point averages for students who are preparing to teach are at the top rather than the bottom of the heap, as some critics insist is the usual case. Emphasis is placed on the general, all-university nature of honors. The focus lies outside the School of Education in the broader framework of the university rather than within the professional sequence itself. Actually, the approach is largely that of the involvement of interested faculty of the School of Education in work with the total honors program.

---

[3] One such course is organized in terms of major problems within the area of educational psychology. Faculty members engaged in research on these problems are invited to involve students in various aspects of the studies.

[4] See the following articles and note in *The Superior Student:* "Colloquia at the University of Colorado," March 1961, p. 16; "Freshman Engineering Program," May 1961, p. 13; "Notes," November 1960, p. 24. See also "Honors at the University of Colorado," a mimeographed manual on the program.

Honors work in education at Colorado is also considered a means of introducing noneducation students to the nature, structure, challenge, and issues of American education. This is a somewhat different approach from that usually found in schools of education and may come to have special significance in general education programs. These courses serve two kinds of students: those who think they might like to become teachers but are not sure, and those already committed to a career who want to explore the whole reality of education, its place in the pluralistic American culture, the problem of academic freedom, and the structure and finances of education.

At the University of Oregon,[5] the aim of the Honors College is the creation of a distinctive and separate honors environment. It has its own faculty and administration and sets its own requirements. The philosophy of the Honors College is that honors students should have a different lower division program from regular students and should also be able to involve themselves in independent work to the extent they wish. During the first 2 years, most of the honors student's time is devoted to required core courses in three curricular areas. Actually, through reading in the summer, a student may prepare himself for the comprehensive examination in any of the core courses and receive credit without being enrolled in the course. Systematic counseling is characteristic of all 4 years.

In the last 2 years, honors work is provided by the departments and professional schools in cooperation with the Honors College. There is no attempt on the part of the Honors College to tell the various schools and departments what kind of program they must have, but established workable arrangements provide for independent work of some kind, and more experience in writing than would normally be expected, usually including an honors thesis. There must also be a final oral examination. In addition, there are upper division colloquia which bring together 6 to 10 students from the various disciplines to discuss problems outside their major fields. One objective of the program is to bring the students into the community of superior students of the whole university so that they identify themselves with each other. For this purpose, an Honors College Center is provided where they can meet informally or study. Careful evaluation studies of the program have been inaugurated.

The Western Washington State College,[6] only recently changed from a teachers college to a general college, does not have the problems of communication between arts and education faculties faced by some universities. As part of the cooperative endeavor of the system, prospective teachers must be approved both by the subject-matter departments and by the professional education staff, and an effort has been made to obtain in all departments faculty who, besides being thoroughly competent in their fields, have had some experience in the public schools. At present, interdisciplinary honors colloquia are required for all honors students in education. Stress is placed on the careful reading of major documents of culture. There is a senior thesis with a tutorial.

---

[5] See the following article and note in *The Superior Student:* "The Honors College," March 1960, p. 7; and "Notes," March 1961, p. 31.

[6] "Notes," *The Superior Student,* November 1960, p. 24, and November–December 1961, p. 20.

Further, at Western Washington State emphasis is given to motivating the extremely capable but sometimes underachieving prospective teacher. Officials say this requires an attitude of some permissiveness in initial selection, involves some risks, and is discouraging at times; however, the practice is expected to result in the salvage of some who would perhaps have had quite undistinguished careers had it not been for the program.

The progress reported in the preceding examples is encouraging but unfortunately not yet typical of teacher education across the Nation. The fault, however, does not lie entirely with pedagogical preparation. There are also weaknesses which result from other factors. For example, it is not necessary for teachers to be practitioners of the disciplines they profess—the composition teacher does not have to be a writer; the history teacher, a historian; the science teacher, a scientist; and the foreign language teacher, an ambassador of the culture he represents. Prospective teachers should, nevertheless, be given a solid foundation in the subjects they are to teach, as well as the liberal background that will make them educated individuals. The need is one of both breadth and depth.

The problem seems most pronounced for students preparing to teach in elementary schools. Potential teachers who yearn for the excitement of rigorous college-level courses may be repelled from teaching by academic programs too close to the grade level for which they are being prepared. Familiarity with skills, subject matter, and activities appropriate for elementary schools—a necessity for successful teaching, to be sure—might be allocated to the internship, when prospective teachers are giving full time to learning how to teach.

To deny honors experiences to bright students as a price for becoming teachers simply because some teacher education programs in the past have done so is to risk driving out of the profession those able people who might be the most effective leaders in education in the future. On the other hand, to provide honors programs for prospective teachers shows some promise of attracting superior students into teaching and of giving them the thrill as well as the headaches of applying the processes by which knowledge is gained. In the long run, it may provide models for upgrading the entire professional sequence for teachers. In fact, it may make better teachers of those who can stand the pace.

Honors in Professional Education Programs

> **If an honors program has already been instituted on a campus and if participation, continuation, or extension of the program is being sought by or within a school of education, then the motif should be more of the same work of inquiry. To attract honors students, a school of education must offer them a like kind of intellectual engagement. An easy but fatal mistake would be made if one substituted exposition of honors work for the doing of honors work. Exposition or theory courses about honors might or might not be of the kind and calibre deserving the name of honors, depending upon their substance and the quality of work undertaken by students.—Edward W. Strong,** ***University of California***

As the work in any particular field of study reaches an advanced level, it takes on a professional character. There is a certain continuity of emphasis as study begun as an undergraduate becomes more thorough and specialized during the graduate years. There is a movement from breadth to depth, a movement toward concentration for the sake of developing mastery. The honors student moves earlier into the kind and calibre of work which formerly characterized the final stages of study.

The situation does not seem to be radically different, whether the honors work is in general education or in a professional school. Participation in honors work, whether it be in a campus-wide honors program, or in a program developed within the professional school, or in some combination, is animated by common purposes, even though somewhat different emphases are expected to be lodged in the particular disciplinary clusterings of students. The difference in emphasis does not necessarily constitute a weakness and may indeed be a strength, especially in the upper undergraduate years.

The tasks of preparing teachers have generally been viewed as a threefold development: Competence in subject matter, especially in the subjects to be taught; an understanding of the learning process, of the educational enterprise, and of interrelationships between school and society; and effective teaching abilities through methods courses and student teaching. The first of these tasks is basic to the others, and the first two of these tasks are considered unquestionably appropriate for honors work. The appropriateness of honors work in the third task, the development of teaching skills, is subject to debate. (See Appendixes A and B.)

The honors program is devoted to achieving greater breadth and greater depth of inquiry, understanding, and appreciation; and its base is therefore substantive, no matter what the subject field or combination of fields. In the professional education courses embodied in the second task, the general characteristics of honors work would not differ markedly from those appropriate in general education. However, there is one important additional aspect which may be characteristic of honors in professional education. This is the development of a professional esprit de corps among teacher candidates, especially those of highest purpose, scholarly grasp, and teaching effectiveness. This esprit de corps is capable of a leavening qualitative influence, both within schools of education and in the institutions in which the individuals subsequently do their teaching. It may, therefore, be a major factor in attracting into the teaching profession many of the better students, thereby contributing to the upgrading of the whole profession and thus to the general improvement of the educational process itself.

Elementary and Secondary Education Majors

> **The dilemma in providing honors for prospective elementary teachers is that, by virtue of the extreme breadth thought necessary in their programs, it is difficult for them to push far enough into any one subject to get to the level which seems appropriate for honors work. The suggestion of a major in the first 4 years and then an internship assumes a 5-year program.—J. W. Maucker, *State College of Iowa***

Time is one of the recurrent practical problems confronting an institution intending either to cope well with teacher preparation or to introduce an honors program in education. The problem is considerably more pronounced for elementary than for secondary majors. The honors experience itself does not necessarily add to the amount of time needed. Rather, the typical teacher-education sequence does not have flexible time within it to include all the configuration of elements, with opportunity for breadth and depth of approach, which are necessary in a good honors program. Unless a student is able to take advantage of a considerable amount of advanced placement, it is difficult for him in 4 years to obtain adequate general education, meet requirements for a full major, accumulate the professional education credits necessary for certification, and do honors work. Fortunately, however, institutions are finding ways to apply honors work toward meeting formal certification requirements. To cope further with the situation, some institutions, indeed some States, are moving toward a 5-year sequence in teacher education.

There has long been a tendency for institutions to require their teacher-education students to have the same general education background as other students. This in itself may provide opportunity for education majors to have some honors experience in the general education program. Furthermore, a number of institutions have been moving toward a required subject major, rather than an optional one, for elementary majors. For those students who are exempt from some of the beginning courses, it is relatively easy to build such a major on top of the required introductory courses.

At the University of Wisconsin, consideration is being given to separate kinds of required subject-matter majors, a disciplinary major and a broad fields major, in order to accommodate the differences in depth and breadth needed by teachers at the different levels of elementary and secondary schools. There is general feeling, however, that a required subject major for all potential elementary teachers would mean an increase in the number of credit hours for the degree. This does not seem unreasonable, in light of similar lengthening of programs in engineering and other professional areas.

New York State recently announced that after 1966, when 5 years of college preparation will be required for the elementary certificate, a full subject-matter concentration will be required. Further, the new regulations provide that where the number of semester hours is specified, the equivalent in honors work will be accepted. The California legislature also has changed certification regulations to make a subject major in an academic area a part of the requirements for a credential for general elementary teaching, but the exact definition of "an academic area" is still being considered by a statewide committee.

At this time, there is no one pattern for education programs that extend into a fifth year or longer. A comprehensive study by the Office of Education shows that in 1959–60 there were 1,976 fifth-year programs in teacher education at 462 institutions. These included 245 systematic 5-year programs at 123 institutions.[7] There is great diversity of practice in the sequences of courses; and the absence of a predominant pattern is evident, both in general fifth-year programs and in the systematic 5-year programs.

---

[7] Henry Harap. *Fifth-Year Programs of Classroom Teacher Education: A Survey Report.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1963 (in preparation).

Opinion is divided as to whether the bright student should invest more time in his initial preparation and then use the fifth year to meet certification requirements, whether subject matter should be taken in the fifth year after the teacher has had experience and knows what will be most valuable, or whether the entire program should be combined and extended. The latter might be the program of the future if we accept the suggestion of all the leaders in the country who say that it takes more than 4 years to train a good teacher for elementary or secondary schools.

While major attention must be focused on programs of future teachers, still some consideration must be given to upgrading the training of present teachers. Over the years the concept of teacher education too often has been restricted to professional programs. In an effort to provide balance between the academic and the professional, some institutions now advise and make definite provisions for experienced teachers to take subject-matter courses at the master's level. At the same time, to accommodate graduates of liberal arts colleges who want to be teachers, some institutions have devised fifth-year programs which are devoted largely to providing the professional training required for certification. Master of Arts in Teaching programs may emphasize professional training, or subject matter, or a combination of the two, depending upon the needs of individual students.[8] Since higher standards for admission are set for the fifth year than for the regular program at most institutions, the essence of these programs is considered at least a step in the direction of honors.

Regardless of the length of the teacher education program, certification requirements exert a powerful influence on its makeup and hence are a limiting factor to be considered in planning to include honors work. In some States, highly inflexible certification regulations specify the exact number of hours required in each of a whole list of courses. Even though exploratory and experimental programs show that the time served in courses is not a valid measure of accomplishments, such certification requirements contribute to the persistence of stereotyped programs. It must also be recognized that some States issue so large a proportion of substandard certificates that, no matter what the stated standard certification requirements are, the breach in itself becomes the standard.

---

[8] "Honors and the Improvement of Teaching—Ford Grant Programs," an ICSS report including short reports by 15 universities on special features of Ford Grant programs, *The Superior Student*, May 1961, p. 16–20; and "The Yale Master of Arts in Teaching Program," address delivered by Edward J. Gordon, at ACLS–AAAS Conference on New Directions in Teacher Education, in New York, February 23–24, 1962 (Available from John R. Mayor, Director of American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C.).

Wherever certification requirements are flexible enough, it may be possible to consolidate existing course materials, perhaps introducing a broader approach to teacher training, and permit superior students to deal with all the material in a shorter period of intensive study, followed by proficiency examinations for which they can be given the State-wide required credit. With the attention now being given to programs for academically talented students, some States are moving in this direction in an effort to provide superior teachers in programs designed for these academically talented students.

The growing demand for college teachers is another factor which has an indirect influence upon the development of honors programs for prospective elementary and secondary teachers. Unless gifted students interested in teaching are offered intellectually challenging teacher education programs, they are likely to elect to do honors in a strictly academic discipline and gravitate towards college teaching. To the extent that this siphoning takes place, fewer bright students will be left in the field of professional education.

It must be recognized, of course, that there is a definite need for college teachers who themselves are experienced in the honors approach. Indiana University has a 3-year master's program, made possible by a Ford Foundation grant and deliberately aimed at the preparation of college teachers. At the end of the sophomore year, students are selected for the program on the basis of academic and personal qualifications. As far as possible, these students are incorporated into existing honors programs or placed in special programs designed for them. The program is concerned both with the sound liberal education of undergraduates and at the same time with expediting the eventual receipt of the Ph. D. For example, to make certain that students will be able to meet the requirements for graduate training, language emphasis is sufficient for students to be prepared to pass examinations in two languages by the time they receive their master's and are ready for further graduate study. Negotiations are presently under way with other 4-year colleges in the State to arrange to take into the program and support for at least a year of graduate study those students identified on their campuses at the end of the sophomore year. One way of describing the program is that Indiana University is attempting in the sophomore year to make the identification that the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation makes following the end of the junior year.

A closer functional relationship should exist between honors programs and the graduate schools, both in theory and in practice, especially insofar as the education of teachers is concerned. This is true not only for departmental honors programs but particularly so for the interdisciplinary aspects of general honors, where no discipline can be an island. Graduate schools might well consider setting up interdisciplinary graduate seminars for the sciences, the social sciences, the humanities, and interrelated areas. Such seminars or colloquia at the graduate level might serve with other things as a type of corrective to insular departmentalism.

From the general honors point of view, it is important to acknowledge that many of the great contributions to culture, past and present, were not made from academic departmental perspectives. This is something that graduate schools of education might well recall when they have their quarrels with the subject matter disciplines. Certainly, graduate schools of education should be protagonists for, and exemplars of, an emphasis on the works that deal with education in the totality of culture. It would be one of the best contributions they could make towards curing the maladies of overdepartmentalization at all levels.

Teachers are inclined to teach as they were taught. Too many professors are unprepared to face the challenge of interdisciplinary undertakings of a high order such as are needed in honors. They tend to avoid, or evade, the challenge of the bright students, whose minds keep ranging beyond departmental walls. To the extent that they can combine depth with range, those who teach potential teachers can produce a leavening effect which will enable our schools to give future generations the emphasis upon quality that is so much in demand.

Student Teaching

> **If we separate the practice of teaching from honors in teacher education, we shall have honors graduates who nonetheless are poor teachers.—Lindley Stiles, *University of Wisconsin***

There has been so much controversy about whether student teaching is appropriate for honors work that the experience is here treated separately from other professional educational work which is part of the preparation of teachers. In reality, the debate hinges on the conception of the nature of honors work and the extent to which performance and the inquiry into ideas are interrelated in the pursuit of scholarship.

The question, then, is whether by definition honors should be limited to traditionally recognized areas of academic excellence or whether it should also include some kind of recognition of excellence in artistic creation or performance, including educational performance.[9] There are those who maintain that the virtuoso or performing artist should spend his time in an art school or music conservatory and that the university is obliged to treat artistic creation or performance as useful experience—along with appreciation—but not as an honors accomplishment.

In the fine arts, for example, courses in art history or in the understanding and appreciation of art are unquestionably considered appropriate for the honors approach. However, there are some people who maintain that, in a course in painting, a creative student with a flare for handling materials may or may not be a scholar and therefore may or may not be aware of the substantive learning associated with the experience of painting a picture. Therefore, they would not consider the painting of a picture to be appropriate for honors work unless it could be shown that considerable substantive learning accompanied the application of skill.

Typewriting is an example which can clarify the debate still further. Clearly, it is more mechanical and less creative than the painting of a picture. Those who consider learning to type a mechanical process would not only deny typewriting a place in an honors program; some would deny degree credit for courses in typewriting. On the other hand, it is possible for a student to learn to type in connection with the study of learning theory. For the superior student interested in the psychology of learning, such a course, it might be argued, could conceivably qualify for honors work.

Those who take the attitude that students learn to teach by teaching, with criticism and analysis by the supervisor, hold that student teaching is a method of being coached for a skill—an important skill, to be sure—and that this experience differs from substantive inquiry, which they consider the key ingredient of honors. If practice is the confirmation of a theory or hypothesis in an inquiry, they hold, then that practice takes on substantive content. Likewise, where the practice in question is an art and the experience results in an understanding of the principles of composition, then the two are not isolated. But, unless student teaching is performed with definite concern for its relationships to the theories or ideas involved, then it becomes simply a skill and lacks the necessary ingredient for an honors approach.

Advocates of honors programs for teacher education do not like to see student teaching equated with learning skills in typewriting. They think of student teaching as being a point at which there is creativity, at which there is growth, indeed at which philosophy—the philosophy of education—becomes the substance. If we separate the philosophy of teaching from honors in teacher education, they say we shall have honors graduates who nonetheless are poor teachers. In fact, in honors programs in any professional area—not just in teacher education—care must be taken not to neglect the more practical aspects. Theory and practice should go together, not merely in the utilization of practice in the field of theory but also in the sense that some of the most exciting ideas might be engendered in practice and brought back to the discussion for analysis. In other words, these educators maintain that honors in teacher education must not be content with mere brilliant theorizing about education to the neglect of the homelier and perhaps finally more important tasks of testing theory through observation and practice.

---

[9] This question is treated in more detail in Appendixes A and B, where the address by Edward W. Strong and comments by other participants in the ICSS conference show both sides of the controversy.

If a student teaching program is accompanied by work in learning theory or methodology, the actual performance of students can provide the evidence for testing hypotheses, for showing up clichés in theory, for actual advancement in basic learning. In such a program, student teaching can be as exciting and as involved with ideas as anything in pure theory taken as such. At the same time, the individualized coaching or supervision may have its parallel with the tutorial aspects of other kinds of honors programs.

In spite of differences in conception of what constitutes honors work, there seems to be general agreement among authorities in teacher education that those responsible for supervised experiences—as well as those responsible for the liberal arts aspect, the history and philosophy of education, and educational psychology—have an obligation to conceive challenging, stimulating, and distinctive ways of handling bright students. They maintain that there are activities which are appropriate for gifted students in applied areas which are different from those that are appropriate for the less talented; and when the distinguished and imaginative work in student teaching seems to meet the quality challenge of honors programs, they advocate designating the work as "honors" and giving honors credit for it.

At this point, although there seems to be little consensus of what combination of elements constitute an honors program in student teaching, the practical experience aspect of teacher education programs for superior students is receiving increased attention. During the past year, for example, four universities in upstate New York—Cornell, Syracuse, Rochester, and Buffalo—have been working together on plans for a new program for superior prospective teachers. The practical phase of the program will include an internship experience in the senior year, in which the students will do full-time teaching for one semester. The schools have been carefully selected to see that interns are placed where change is going on, and especially where the method of inquiry is a fundamental part of the teaching. Those who are working with the program believe that student teaching experience of honors quality can be provided in any situation where the best students work in the best schools with the best teachers in the best programs which can be devised.

Some hold that, for a bright student, it ought to be possible, with the right teacher, to make any subject into an honors experience. From Peabody College comes the example of a girl in elementary education who qualified as a full-time classroom teacher in about half of a full quarter. She used the rest of the time to extend her learning possibilities: as a principal's intern, learning the problems that come into such an office; as a teacher, joining other teachers at the grades below and above the grade level which she was to teach; and as a participant in the junior high school, seeing the problems of articulation between the elementary and the junior high school years.

In any case, there can be little doubt that, when the bright student teacher is assigned to an exceptionally competent supervising teacher, the tutorial kind of experience can provide numerous opportunities for use of the analytical approach. Methods of inquiry and the attempts to evaluate results critically can most certainly be involved. If a teacher education institution is going to hand out some kind of accolade to those who have done honors work, the quality of the student's work in student teaching or in the internship should not be excluded in determining individual qualifications for honors recognition, although it may not be necessary to call the experience an honors course.

Problems and Promise

> **Honors must remain vigilant against organizational "busyness," against mere reiteration of claims of excellence accompanied by meager or narrowly elitist programs. Claims of achievement must be subjected to rigorous analysis to forestall mere affectations and mannerisms of excellence.—Joseph W. Cohen, *ICSS***

The honors scene is likely to be a fertile one for the exploration of both methods and ends in all education, thereby contributing to the development of cooperation between the subject disciplines and education in such exploration. Nevertheless, there are theory and practice issues that emerge with reference to promising programs for superior students. The theory is being progressively clarified, and practice is being tested through research at many of the institutions with honors programs. Further evidence of the general interest in these programs has been indicated by conferences, such as the one in November 1962 sponsored by the Committee on Personality Development in Youth of the Social Science Research Council. This conference was concerned with evaluation and research in honors programs.

Advocates of honors programs believe the honors approach is the answer to society's demand for general redesigning of college education. However, if honors programs are to offer such promise, they must be able to withstand the criticisms of those who remain loyal to the traditional program. There are four groups who may regard the honors program as a threat: those educators who are equalitarian by tradition and favor a minimum of grouping lest some be stigmatized as second-class citizens; those college administrators charged with making the books balance, who know that honors programs, if they are much good, are expensive; those faculty members who fear an overload of work in the absence of adequate allowance for staffing; and those grade-conscious bright students who fear inflexible use of the normal curve in honors courses. In the total picture, the progress of honors programs depends upon counteracting the fears of these groups. This requires not only adequate planning and implementation of practices but also adequate evaluation and objective publicity.

On the other side of the coin is the danger of a tightly closed circle developing in honors if conceptionalization develops into a kind of doctrinaire alliance of insiders. It is conceivable that this sort of thing could pyramid and become an extremely artificial fad, if there is more attention to questions of how to organize programs than there is to the attack on the original problem which started as a sense of irritation because bright students were not treated in a way that is appropriate for bright students. To the extent that those who are concerned with honors continue their campaign for appropriate ways of teaching bright people, they will be making honors programs the proving ground of a real revolution in the approach to methodology in higher education.

Content v. Method

> **It isn't a question of methodology versus content. For any given content, we seek that method which enhances and enriches the learning experience and causes the student to handle the content with which he is dealing in a more efficient manner.—Stephen Romine, *University of Colorado***

The real promise of honors programs—and the answer to many of their problems and pitfalls—lies in resolving the controversy between content and method. There are those who feel that the general education movement is being buried as rapidly as possible all over the country because it assumed that content could be handed out by way of sound generalizations. The real concern, some maintain, is that a student be able to act like a scientist and think like a scientist, act like a critic and think like a critic, act like a philosopher and think like a philosopher—that is to say, he ought to be able to function within the discipline. He must know and understand content, to be sure, but he must be able to do more than remember 70 percent of those sound generalizations somebody handed him in some "Man in the Physical World" course. Lively professional schools and departments in arts and sciences want people who can *do* things, who are competent in the methodology of a discipline. Thus they hold that the dichotomy between content and method in honors programs simply does not exist, that these are two different questions. One question is what the content of the curriculum of the honors students is, and the other is what kinds of teaching conditions exist for him.

The answer to the question of content is as variable as the university itself and may take the direction of breadth, depth, acceleration, enrichment, or integration, depending upon the philosophy of those who plan the program. However, overemphasis upon content can result in the pedantry of fact at the expense of flexibility and curiosity. After the first flush of novelty wears off, the work may be just as sterile, confining, and stultifying to students as regular courses. Without adequate attention to content, honors programs could simply provide license for irresponsible and glib verbalization—in effect, a means of escape from the rigor of academic discipline. Thus, the job of an honors program is more than the mere acceleration of bright students; it must expand their knowledge, of course; but it must also improve their skills in the use of knowledge, and it must stimulate their curiosity so that they continue to learn.

The answer to the question of method in honors is the deliberate provision of conditions in which a student can have continuous and intensely valuable learning experiences, no matter what the field. Interdepartmental planning or collaboration must include content, but it must also give adequate attention to the teaching-learning conditions which determine the climate for learning. In an effective honors program, the student takes a more active role in the learning process than would be expected in the regular program. Classes are likely to be smaller so that the student can do more effective writing, more discriminating reading, more independent and demanding work, more purposeful experimenting, reacting, appreciating, or discussing. Important factors in creating this kind of teaching-learning situation are teachers who do not feel that they have to do all the talking and students who have demonstrated a genuine interest in ideas. Such a program cannot be fabricated with the help of scissors and pastepot out of earmarked sections of existent courses already listed in the catalog.

In honors, then, it is not a matter of content v. method but a question of finding or creating the best combination of content and method for a particular purpose. In other words, the honors student's goal of excellence goes beyond the mere mastery of fact and asks the question, "Knowledge for what?" The dichotomy between content and method, therefore, is an artificial one. The two are so interrelated in the accomplishment of educational objectives that neither can be neglected without jeopardizing not only the quality of the learning experience but also its value to the student after he makes the transition from formal education to life.

Climates of Cooperation: Articulation, Integration, Coordination

> **There is imperative need for mutual cooperation—for what I would call a "climate of cooperation" in working on the problems of structuring an honors program. How cooperation is actually achieved is immaterial. The essential thing is that it be achieved. This tests the uniqueness, the artistry if you will, on each campus.—James H. Robertson, *University of Michigan***
>
> **Effective articulation will be even more necessary as schools permit able and ambitious students to**

> **move ahead at their own speed. Education must be a continuous process, not a series of discontinuities.—Charles R. Keller, *John Hay Fellows Program***

Articulation, integration, and coordination are among the important elements in maintaining a climate of cooperation in honors programs. A good honors program should be conceived and implemented in a climate of cooperation among faculties of liberal arts subjects and those of professional schools *within* the institution. There should also be effective cooperation *among* institutions in the sharing of information and in the exploration of mutual problems in their search for workable unity. There is need also for cooperation between institutions at the various levels, such as the secondary school, the junior college, the university, and the graduate school. Only by stressing vertical as well as horizontal communication and other interrelationships can we expect the bright student—or any other student, for that matter—to avoid repetition, to lengthen and deepen his thinking span, and to make the progress of which he is capable.

There are numerous examples of cooperation between high schools and colleges in providing suitable programs for superior students.[10] These programs may involve acceleration, enrichment, or ability grouping, depending upon the types of learning involved, the educational objectives sought, and the problems of administration encountered.

Perhaps the best known type of plan for superior students is the Advanced Placement Program administered by the College Entrance Examination Board. In this program, superior students become eligible for advanced standing in college in a number of areas on the basis of examinations on college-level work which they have completed in high school.[11] One of the major features of this program is the improved articulation resulting from bringing college and high school teachers together on examination committees, as readers of examination papers, and at annual 3-day subject conferences in connection with the Advanced Placement Program.

Another type of advanced standing program which is gaining in popularity provides a form of flexible progression from high school to college by permitting superior students to take college courses concurrently with their high school programs. California passed legislation in 1959 authorizing junior colleges to admit to part-time study superior 12th-grade students, who continue to attend high school classes for at least the minimum school day.[12] Other schools have similar programs on a purely cooperative-planning basis, and reports indicate significant advantages in both acceleration and enrichment for students and in articulation among institutions.

---

[10] *The Superior Student,* since its inception in April 1958, has published more than 40 items (articles and notes) on high school-college liaison. See also *The American High School and the Talented Student,* by Frank O. Copley, Ann Arbor, Mich.: The University of Michigan Press, 1961, 92 p.

[11] Copley, loc. cit.; Shirley A. Radcliffe, *Advanced Standing,* New Dimensions in Higher Education, Number 8. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961, 24 p.

At the University of Pittsburgh, a Coordinated Education Center has been set up to deal with articulation and cooperative planning at all levels, from the elementary grades to graduate school. The first of a series of reports summarizes considerations, describes procedures, and discusses implications of flexible progression.[13] Flexible progression is defined as a general plan for permitting the able student to move from one institutional level to the next whenever he seems prepared to do so. Examples are drawn primarily from schools in the Pittsburgh area, but the report suggests possibilities for cooperative planning anywhere.

Articulation between levels of study is more than a device to prevent overlap or repetition. It can help to build mutual understandings about objectives and about the appropriateness of acceleration in certain types of learning situations and enrichment in others. At the same time that it stimulates action toward ideal programs, it can build intelligent acceptance of necessary compromises between what is desired and what is administratively and financially feasible as the program progresses. In other words, improved articulation can help institutions at both levels to devise common goals for helping students work toward maximum development and to find the best ways of working toward those goals.

No less important than the articulation between levels of instruction, the high school and the college, for example, is the integration and coordination of the total college program for superior students. Since prospective teachers take about three-fourths of their work in liberal arts departments, professors in the liberal arts have as great a responsibility for the education of teachers as have the professors of education. They should, therefore, cooperatively conceive and jointly execute programs for the preparation of teachers. The University of Colorado, among others, is concerned with minimizing the separation between general and professional education which normally begins in the junior year. Students in education are encouraged to take honors courses with other students from other fields in both the junior and senior years in order to continue exploring the world of ideas with students from other disciplines. At Michigan State, the growing respect for the quality of students in education is believed to be related to the fact that these students take a substantial amount of honors work in other parts of the university.

---

[12] "Study of Enrollment of Superior High School Students in California Public Junior Colleges," Sacramento, Calif.: Bureau of Junior College Education, State Department of Education. 7 p. (Mimeo.).

[13] C. M. Lindvall with the collaboration of J. Steele Gow, Jr., and Francis J. Rifugiato, *Meeting the Needs of the Able Student Through Provisions for Flexible Progression*, a report of the Regional Commission on Educational Coordination and the Coordinated Education Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1962. 29 p.

It is not enough to have a departmental honors program in education *or* an honors program in general education. To fulfill its proper role, an honors program for prospective teachers should involve all possible resources of the university that might provide honors quality work. The general education program should provide the relevant background for the more sophisticated consideration of education issues, thus helping to bridge the gap between college or general honors, honors in the subject major, and honors in the school of education. For example, courses in American philosophy should not be slanted unduly in the direction of educational issues but should certainly consider them; courses in American intellectual history should look at ideas and developments relevant to education; courses in American sociology should include attention to its educational system; and courses in political science should look at how decision-making processes affect the schools. Such an approach in the school of liberal arts is appropriate for all students as a basis for informed leadership on educational questions. For those majoring in education, it provides the necessary background for study of critical educational problems related to their careers.

In addition to what is to be gained from deliberately planned interdisciplinary content, there is also the sort of cross-fertilization that comes from student analysis of situations from the points of view of various disciplines. Such give and take of ideas is invaluable experience for the teacher who will later help to establish climates of cooperation in which succeeding generations of students will find nurture for maximum development of their capabilities.

Selection of Honors Students

> **I do not underestimate the power of honors to awaken the intellectual interests of the gifted-but-lethargic, but a word needs to be said for the student who is, by the usual measures, not quite as bright as the brightest—yet who gives evidence of that genuine interest in ideas that marks the conduct of every good honors program. When the competition is severe for admission to the program, I would urge that demon-**

strated intellectuality be given full marks.—James L. Jarrett, *Western Washington State College*

The selection of students for an honors program involves more than the determination of cut-off scores on intelligence or achievement tests or on grade-point averages. The conforming "A" student may be more easily recognized than the underachieving student with a high I.Q. It is possible, however, to overdo "potentiality" in the absence of objective evidence about performance in learning situations. Some colleges have found cooperation with neighboring high schools a useful practice in determining admissions to 4-year honors programs, but even this is not foolproof. For this reason, admission and dismissal from the honors program should be flexible enough that students will not be penalized for errors in judgment of the admissions committee. This is especially true when the honors program begins in the freshman year, which seems to be the current trend.

Such flexibility means that, by mutual agreement, a student registered for honors should be free to move into a regular program without penalty if it is determined that he was prematurely placed in a program not suitable for him. It also means that there are provisions which enable "late bloomers" to get into the honors program when they have demonstrated their ability for honors work.

The difference in maturity ages of students, and especially the general difference in maturity ages between men and women, poses special problems in the selection of honors students.[14] Because women mature earlier and are inclined to be grade-getters or conformists, they tend to dominate the upper scholastic ranks of high school graduating classes and of freshman and sophomore college classes. Four years later, the number of men and women at the top tends to approach equality. Consequently, some suggest going lower in the overall rankings in selecting men than in selecting women for special attention in honors programs on the freshman level in order to come out 4 years later with a more nearly equal distribution of honors graduates of the two sexes.

The ratio of women to men of the upper-intelligence range in the teaching profession is not the point at issue. Not only do a larger percentage of men of college age go to college, but the retention rate for men is greater.[15] The problem, then, seems to be the difference in maturity rate of individuals of the two sexes rather than the difference in intellectual potential.[16] It has long been recognized that the roles of women are discontinuous, that women have mixed goals of domesticity and professional careers. A given number of women honors graduates, therefore, is not likely to result in as many active careers as would the same number of men honors gradutes. The solution to the problem may be intricately related to counseling. If bright women, through acceleration, can be brought farther along toward realistic goals for that period before they assume family responsibilities, the supply of qualified teachers may be significantly increased.

---

[14] See the following articles in *The Superior Student:* Margaret Mead, "Gender in the Honors Program," May 1961, p. 2–6; J. W. Cohen, "Women in Honors," October 1961, p. 10–11; and "On Margaret Mead's 'Gender in the Honors Program'—Conflicting Views: Male and Female," March–April 1962, p. 16–23.

[15] Edith M. Huddleston, *Opening (Fall) Enrollment in Higher Education, 1960: Analytic Report,* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 14.

In the context of an actual institutional situation, problems related to the selection of men and women for honors work may take on immense importance. For example, Indiana University came face to face with this problem with reference to its Three-Year Masters Program. In attempting to be realistic in selecting from sophomore honors students, predominantly female, those who might be considered potential college teachers, the committee faced the dilemma of identifying the greatest possible number of students who might be on college faculties 10 years hence. This task involves problems of differential counseling; for if a young woman is good, she can go into elementary or high school teaching with certainty, while college teaching is a somewhat more remote possibility.

While the issues related to the maturity of men and women students remain unresolved, there is no question about the need for an overall increase in the number of teachers who know what honors work is by having done it themselves. But if the threshold into honors is lowered to increase numbers, quality will suffer. Since it takes excellent quality in staffing and content of an honors program to draw excellent students to it, it might be better to err on the side of high selectivity, especially in the initial stages of the program. Well begun may insure better done thereafter.

---

[16] In this connection, it is interesting to note that women's colleges have in general paid much less attention to the work done in advanced placement programs than have men's colleges, with the result that the number of young men who take advanced placement work is greater than the number of young women, in spite of the earlier maturity of women.

Staffing and Financing Honors Programs

> **The key factor in the success of honors is the instructor himself.—Henry L. Adams, *Western Washington State College***

The quality of any honors program depends primarily upon the teachers. Indeed, the teacher is the prime determinant of the content, the methodology, the objectives, and, in fact, the results of any course of study. Although content may to some extent be specified by administrative decree, the quality of the learning experience itself depends upon the philosophy, the enthusiasm, and the skill of the staff. Desirable results do not automatically come with designation of an individual to teach an honors course regardless of how well that individual may know his subject. They cannot be superimposed by administrative direction. For that reason, it is not enough simply to staff an honors program with those faculty members who have the longest experience or the greatest amounts of advanced training, no matter how willing the institution may be to finance reduced teaching loads to provide for smaller classes and additional time for planning.

Assignment of honors courses to bright young professors may not be a foolproof answer either, although they may be less burdened by habits than are some of their more mature colleagues, and some of them may be fired with enthusiasm to try new things. At the beginning of their careers, it is not unusual to find that many younger staff members are remarkable conformists, acquiescing to the academic customs and traditions which, as graduate students, they helped to perpetuate. Bright though they may be, these may bring to honors courses little more than an enthusiasm for the chance to know bright students and an eagerness to be identified as honors course instructors.

The staff member selected or assigned to an honors program, therefore, must be able to do more than pass on to receptive bright students the wealth of his own knowledge or the wisdom of his own thinking. He must inspire them to learn for themselves, to locate information wherever it may be found and evaluate it to find out what is reliable and valuable, to analyze pros and cons and recognize alternatives and potentialities—in short, to make the learning experience contribute to the students' ability to think for themselves.

Administratively, a good honors program is expensive. It requires staff time not only for cooperative planning of the honors program itself and determining how it fits into the institution's total program but also staff time for the planning of individual honors courses.

Although a dedicated staff may voluntarily carry a limited honors program as an overload during the initial flourish of enthusiasm, they cannot be expected to do so indefinitely.

Since honors classes are smaller than other classes, a larger faculty is required to accommodate increases in the number of honors participants and honors courses. There should also be a fair allowance for participation in colloquia, tutorials, and general administration of the program. Additional library materials may be needed to accommodate honors students. Allowance should also be made for additional testing in connection with admission of students to the honors program. There should be provision for evaluation of the program itself to determine its effectiveness and potentialities for improvement.

In other words, quality in programs for superior students is no accident. It requires planning, teamwork, and dedication; and it requires adequate financing. Recruitment of faculty for honors work is more likely to succeed where the demand for quality is pitched high. Like will attract like. Unless the program can be adequately budgeted, it should not be undertaken with the hope that it will then flourish, unless there is reasonable prospect that an initial sacrifice will bring funds needed for continuation. In the final analysis, we cannot afford to do less than the best for the best students.

Since teachers are inclined to teach as they are taught, the selection of staff for honors programs for potential teachers is especially important. Some institutions insist that such teachers have some experience in the public schools, and many provide opportunities for staff to observe in the schools at the levels for which they are preparing teachers. It is not enough for the education teacher to expound the theory of honors work. He must practice it in his own classes if he expects his students in turn to be able to deal effectively with their superior students.

Guidance and Placement

> **Flexibility is the crux of honors. This means that you treat students as individuals. You cannot say, "This is what I'm going to do with honors students," but rather, "This is what I do with John who happens to be an honors student. It is quite different from what I do with Tom, who also happens to be one."— Loraine V. Shepard, *Michigan State University***

> **The honors program ought to be part of the total program, and not something that is just added on. In the stress on more and more knowledge, pressing honors students to take more courses simply because they are brighter and can do more work is no replacement for the tailor-made program in which the student gets a balanced diet in the various disciplines and intensive study in those areas which are most vital to his own goals.—Wallace L. Anderson, *State College of Iowa***

Properly selected, honors students present a complex picture of individualized needs and problems. Honors programs therefore have a built-in flexibility and a variety of alternatives from among which the student, in consultation with his advisor, may choose. Advising is thus a subtle factor in honors, and its proper organization and implementation are important to the success of the program. The advisor must know, for example, how to handle the indecision of the bright, the ones who are so good they can move in any of a number of directions, and what to do about the students who are consciously grade-getters, those who have met the criteria but are pushing for the wrong reasons.

It is believed that the institutions that are doing the best job of honors counseling have four characteristics in common: (1) Honors counselors are selected; (2) counseling is a recognized and organized faculty activity; (3) advisors have power to make decisions; and (4) advisors are given due recognition and reward.[17]

The question of who advises depends largely on the size of the institution and its resources. Academic counseling of honors students is usually done by regular faculty members. There should, however, be relevant liaison with the regular guidance staff; and the latter should become increasingly aware of the problems and objectives of honors programs. Some members of the guidance staff should concentrate on these problems as specialists.

The reason faculty advisers are normally preferred over guidance staff for academic counseling of honors students is that the adviser has to work with the student at the point in his studies where his commitment is most vital. Furthermore, he must seek to enhance involvement of the student in all that is substantial to his intellectual quest. The important thing is that an appropriate overall climate be created and that counseling responsibility be adequately worked out so that each student at any time will know to whom he can go for advice.

---

[17] James H. Robertson, "Statement on Honors Counseling," *The Superior Student*, October 1961, p. 6; James H. Robertson, "Academic Advising in Colleges and Universities—Its Present State and Present Problems," *North Central Quarterly*, January 1958.

An honors adviser has to be one who can help a student determine the program that will be of greatest value to him, both as a person and as a job holder, quite apart from the biases of the advisor himself. A good advisor does not hound every bright student to plan ahead toward the Ph. D., whether the student wants to or not. He does not look down upon the student who honestly wishes to teach at the elementary or secondary level, and at the same time he does not get in the way of one who wants to teach at the university level. He does not divert a woman to a less spectacular job because of her sex; nor does he insist that every woman should go into either elementary or secondary teaching simply because children are thought to receive greater sympathy and understanding from women than from men. By the same token, he does not advise a male student to go into teaching simply because the profession is thought to be in need of men. However, being aware of the earlier maturity of women and the tendency for their careers to be discontinuous, the advisor may in some cases favor acceleration of a woman student in order to make fuller use of feminine talent and get her into her chosen career earlier.

There is need for further exploration of experience and research findings on numerous unresolved issues related to men and women in honors and on the problems of differential counseling with respect to the preparation of teachers. Certainly, these topics and their inter-relationships might well receive attention at some of the future conferences on honors.

A further problem in guidance of students arises out of inadequate communication between faculties in arts and sciences and those in education. This can leave the student in a kind of "no man's land" insofar as teacher education is concerned. There have been reports, for example, that general honors students have sometimes been advised *not* to go into honors in education even though they planned to become teachers. On the other hand, there may be situations in which students have been pressed into education majors when their personalities and their interests suggest other work. One of the special responsibilities of an honors adviser, then, is to help students think in terms of their own goals, with some rationale for those goals.

In terms of who does the advising, we should not overlook the important influence of the peer group on honors students. One of the things that long experience with honors suggests is the enormous power of the mutual advising and emulation of students. Recognizing the influence of the peer group, the University of Colorado next year will supplement the work of the Honors Council, which does the faculty advising, by assigning groups of 10 entering freshmen to each member of the Honors Union Council, composed of 14 upper division honors students.

The proportion of a student's total program devoted to honors is an important factor in advising because it determines the alternatives available. Not all of a student's work is likely to be in honors courses. Some advising will at times involve placement of the student in those sections of required courses where he will be able to profit most—in certain regular courses where he will meet a teacher crucial for him or gain the needed balance in his total program, or in specially devised group tutorials. In many cases, work of honors quality for a particular student may depend more upon advising than on the label of honors courses as such.

In some institutions, students not formally admitted to the honors program are permitted to enroll in honors sections in fields for which they are qualified and have particular aptitude.

The proportion of work students take in honors courses varies among institutions and indeed at the various class levels and among the departments within institutions. At the College of Education at Illinois, students take two honors sections at the same time, seldom more. At Michigan, advising is considered of such major importance that the program is often described as custom-built for each student. On many campuses, the individual student may be advised to venture into at least one field about which he has some timidity.

At Wisconsin, a minimum of one-third of the student's work is required in honors courses; and, with advising, students may take as much as half of their work in honors. A student must have at least one course under honors procedure in each of two general areas outside of his major, and a certain amount of additional work must be outside the department of the major. Departments have widely different standards as to how much must be honors. In English, about 85 percent must be in honors courses; in other departments, the requirement is as low as 35 percent.

In the Honors College at the University of Oregon, all lower-division students take their distribution requirements in special courses. To provide honors work in the various disciplines, the college requires those who major in liberal arts to take six specific lower-division sequences—one in mathematics, one in natural science, two in humanities, and two in social sciences. The adviser can waive requirements for any student within certain limits, but not because the student is weak in the subject. For example, if the elementary education student has a tight schedule, the adviser may permit him to waive certain core curriculum courses provided they are not areas of student weakness.

Regardless of the pattern which the honors program may take on a particular campus, advising makes a significant contribution to the honors climate or atmosphere. On some campuses, students who apparently have the ability to do honors work want to avoid it; on others, students who cannot qualify for full admission to the program are clamoring to get into those parts of it for which they can qualify. A few programs which bear the name of honors are criticized for doing little more than making good grade-getters, submissive conformers, or academicians in the faculty image rather than opening up for the students the full intellectual life of their time, with all of its controversy and trouble.

The honors task is a subtle one of establishing a pervasive intellectual climate. This is just as important for the school of education and for the preparation of teachers—maybe even more so—as it is in any other field. It may make a powerful contribution to relieving attrition in teacher training programs.

Problems encountered in retaining students in regular teacher education programs include lack of flexibility in course requirements and in the conduct of courses, lack of intellectual content in required courses, and reluctance to being diverted from major fields of academic interest. A responsive and challenging honors program, with competent advising, can help eliminate the last two of these problems and can eventually mitigate the first through influence upon certification regulations.

Certification requirements, in effect, reflect the pressures that have been exerted on State departments of public instruction. As a consequence, they are often a hodgepodge of specifications which may inhibit rather than guarantee the training of good teachers. Part of the problem is to help school officials understand honors programs so that they can place honors graduates in positions appropriate to their capabilities. Organizations within the profession are logical channels for working out the problems of honors and certification. For example, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification has been working with the American Association for the Advancement of Science on improving teacher certification requirements in the fields of mathematics and the sciences.[18]

Some States already accept honors credit toward certification when it is the equivalent of stated certification requirements. In Michigan, for example, certification requirements are stated so generally that it is possible for a person to have a liberal education *and* be certified at the same time. By the "Approved Programs Approach," which is used in Iowa, the State department of public instruction approves institutional programs of teacher preparation which meet certain broad minimum requirements and then accepts the institution's recommendation for certification even though the transcript may not strictly conform to the requirements recommended by the State.

---

[18] "Guidelines for Preparation Programs of Teachers of Secondary School Science and Mathematics, Recommendations of the Teacher Preparation-Certification Study of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification and the American Association for the Advancement of Science." September 1961.

Not only do honors directors need to work with agencies in recommending certification revisions, but they also need to be better informed about career opportunities for superior and talented teachers. As more and more students of honors calibre are directed to challenging teaching positions, the resulting orientation to the intellectual life should contribute to the pool from which superior students can be drawn for the teaching profession in the future.

There is more to recruitment of able teachers than good college programs and good advising, however. Conditions in the schools themselves are an equally significant factor, and the relevance of these to recruitment is treated later in this report.

Evaluation of Programs

> **It is not enough just to show that the teacher who had honors did a good job. The challenge is to find out whether or not in actual fact honors experience leads teachers to perform more capably than teachers with comparable intelligence who did not have honors experience.—J. W. Maucker, *State College of Iowa***

Every honors program should be so constructed as to provide measures and tests of its efficacy. It is important to know the fruits of one's labors. It is not enough simply to devise a program and implement it. There must also be evaluation of its substance and of results to determine what has been done best and what can be done better. In other words, honors programs have to be appraised carefully and objectively to determine whether or not they are doing the job expected of them when they were established.[19]

---

[19] Since April 1958, 38 items (articles and notes) on research and evaluation have appeared in *The Superior Student*. See especially "Research on Honors," October 1961, p. 13–16, with subsections by Robert B. MacLeod, Ralph W. Tyler, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Paul A. Heist. Following proposals made at a meeting of ICSS directors, a Social Science Research Council committee has received a grant to hold a conference on research into honors programs. This conference was held in late November 1962 at Allerton House of the University of Illinois and was under the direction of Paul Heist of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley.

Honors programs must be appraised, first of all, in terms of response and achievement of students while they are in college. It is also important to assess the value of honors programs in terms of the calibre of teachers such students become. These appraisals must be based on something more than opinion. Actually, there is very little evidence that a particular teaching-learning procedure is better than another; and we need to learn a great deal more about approaches to learning. It is to be hoped that honors programs, which put scholarship, a search for evidence, and the method of inquiry at the very pinnacle, will find ways to make these appraisals on the basis of objective evidence. Such evidence must go beyond the question of whether students taking honors work make good grades on tests or in some other way impress their professors.

In honors work in teacher education, the challenge is to be able to demonstrate in some way that honors make a difference in teaching. It must be admitted that there has been very little hard-headed research on the criteria of competence in teaching. Nevertheless, there is need to study what is learned by children, comparing those taught by teachers who have had honors work and those taught by others. Such comparisons, however, must be based on results obtained by teachers who, except for the honors experience, have comparable intelligence and personalities and have had comparable training. In other words, the very cream of the crop might be capable teachers regardless of whether their training was in honors work or in traditional programs.

The solution to these problems of evaluating honors in teacher education is not easy, but a beginning has been made. Research activities are increasingly being sponsored by organizations and foundations and by the Office of Education through its Cooperative Research Program. In addition, many institutions are financing their own educational research activities in order to improve their programs; and the reported results add to the pool of educational effort. Certainly, research related to college honors programs has implications for all students as institutions seek to help every individual to the extent of his educational reach; and research on honors in teacher education has implications for improvement of education at all levels of the educational continuum.

IV. Impact of Honors on Education in the Schools

> **In the last analysis, as always in the past, the quality of our schools will depend primarily on the quality of our teachers. Here, without any question, is the heart of our problem, and here is our central task—to bring to the classroom, seminar, and laboratory the large number of teachers of high qualification necessary to the full success of the educational enterprise.—Sterling M. McMurrin, former U.S. *Commissioner of Education*[1]**
>
> **Ability grouping and the use of the advanced placement approach should be pushed downward, perhaps even into the elementary school, and upward into the colleges, so that any student can learn what he is capable of learning when he is capable of learning it.—Frank O. Copley, *University of Michigan***

No matter how good teacher preparation programs may become, they will not by themselves be sufficient to attract enough able students into teaching. Conditions in the schools must offer opportunities for personal development and career advancement comparable to those in other professions for which these students might equally well prepare themselves, and the students must be made aware that these conditions exist.

The concern for superior students now extends through the whole range of American education from kindergarten on. Significant changes in the education of the academically talented are already taking place in the elementary and high school. These changes not only are creating rewarding and challenging opportunities for the talented; they also are generating a need for more qualified teachers who themselves have had honors experience in college.

---

[1] "The Teacher and His Education in a Free Society," address delivered at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, February 16, 1962. (Mimeo.)

The Quality Emphasis, Its Implications

Unless we pay particular attention to the quality of instruction in the secondary and elementary schools, we may very well back into the kind of situation where the approach to education is economical and orderly but has little else beyond this to recommend it.—Lewis N. Pino, *National Science Foundation*

College honors programs designed to prepare teachers for working with superior elementary and secondary students do not exist in a vacuum. They exist in relation to the totality of experience the able student has both before he comes to college and after he leaves. For example, the college student brings with him intelligence, creativity, motivation, and influences of home environment. Therefore, intelligence may not be completely divorced from creativity, although present instruments do not show a great correlation between the two in the upper intelligence range.

There has been a terrific growth in honors programs in the high schools during recent years, and it may be well to examine one of these programs to see just what factors affect the kind of training teachers of superior high school students need. At Oak Park, Illinois, for example, there is ability grouping—three tracks in required areas—in all courses; and advanced placement courses are available for juniors and seniors. Just as the colleges have been asking the high schools to assist in the early selection of talent for their freshman honors programs, so Oak Park looks to feeder elementary schools to help in the identification of students for its honors programs. Honors and advanced placement courses are characterized by small classes, discussion, flexible schedules, emphasis on skill in notetaking, extensive use of the library, considerable writing, essay tests, and some team teaching.

For this work a teacher must, of course, have a scholarly bent. He must be enthusiastic if he is to evoke enthusiasm in ambitious students. He must have histrionic ability sufficient to attract attention to ideas. In recruiting such a teacher, administrators place great stress on good general education to provide interdisciplinary breadth. Completion of a 5-year or M.A.T. program is looked upon with favor. If he is to stimulate youth to learn, such a teacher must have the kind of mind that encompasses many things, not one steeped in factual knowledge alone. Since independent study and the seminar approach are stressed, any teacher who has had such experiences in his own honors training is considered much better prepared to stimulate critical analysis by superior high school students than is the teacher from a traditional program.

There are many ways in which high school and college teachers can improve the liaison between the two levels.[2] For example, every college professor would be better prepared to do his work if he sometimes visited the high schools to find out what is going on. Conversely, the high school teachers should visit the colleges and universities, particularly freshman and sophomore classes, to observe things they might have forgotten during their own intervening junior, senior, and graduate years, as well as their teaching years. One interesting example of the exchange of high school and college faculty is the arrangement between Carnegie Institute of Technology and Taylor Alderdice High School in Pittsburgh.[3] Such interchange brings increased understanding and respect for problems and practices at the two levels of institutions. The planning conferences of high school and college teachers in connection with the Advanced Placement Program have also been credited with exceptional contributions to improved articulation among teachers of the high schools and the colleges.

The question of methods, how to deal with students of high intellectual or creative ability, must in the final analysis be left largely to those individuals who teach. The real challenge is the quality of experience bright young people have at all levels of the educational continuum. Two major secondary school projects are illustrative of the efforts being made at this level.

A commitment to action programs for able students by secondary schools is one of the objectives of the Inter-Regional Project on Superior and Talented Students. This project was launched in March 1958 by the Commission on Research and Service of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, with financial support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Initially, the project involved 100 schools, some 18,000 selected students in these schools and their parents, and a relatively large number of educators who served as consultants and committee members. Later, other regional accrediting associations joined the project and additional schools affiliated with the program. Much progress has been reported for the elapsed portion of the projected 5-year program. Many thousands of superior students have been identified; special curriculum provisions have been made; individual counseling has increased; group guidance activities, parent conferences, and community involvement have been stepped up; more students of ability are planning to continue education beyond the high school; and useful publications have been produced and distributed to schools and colleges throughout the United States. Current and projected goals and research themes are designed to complement and supplement efforts by other groups.[4]

---

[2] The February 1960 issue of *The Superior Student* is devoted to this subject.

[3] Edward Fenton et al., *College-High School Cooperation: Instituting the Advanced Placement Program in Pittsburgh*, Pittsburgh, Pa.: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1961.

The following research topics have been among the major categories of interest in the Superior and Talented Student Project: Clarification of terminology related to superior and talented students; flexible school entry related to factors other than chronological age on all levels of instruction; relationships among the ingredients of aptitudes, talents, and creativity, and their relationships to intelligence; place of early identification in the total identification process; attributes of motivation, including motivation factors, as they may be related to personal and family deprivation; preparation of future teachers to work with superior and talented students; objective interpretations of teachers' attitudes toward STS programs and toward superior and talented students; mental superiority and talent as they are related to responsibility and leadership; attitudes of communities and groups in the community toward these students; articulation among the various types of programs and levels of the educational continuum; the problem of talented underachievers and the relationships among achievement, ability, and levels of aspiration; grading and other evaluation techniques in "homogeneous" groups; reward systems for outstanding academic achievement; unrecognized groups of superior and talented students, including racial minorities, handicapped children, and students on lower socio-economic levels; girls as a neglected group in higher levels of learning; attitudes of superior and talented students toward teachers, other students, minorities, and the future; effects of ability grouping; relationships of mental superiority and talent to delinquency and gang activities; and projected costs for "optional" educational programs for superior and talented students.

The NEA project on the academically talented student is another example of the general concern for improved educational opportunities for superior students. Initially, this project was made possible by a 1958 grant of the Carnegie Corporation for a 3-year project. There were three focal points of activity: (1) A clearinghouse service of materials assembled from throughout the country and pertaining to programs for academically talented students, (2) a consultant service, and (3) the development of 14 publications dealing with the academically talented student in administration, research, the fine arts, and the academic subjects.[5] Numerous conferences were held in cooperation with departments of the NEA and other professional organizations. An additional grant extended the project for 2 more years, thus enabling the project team to work with major school systems in planning and strengthening their programs for the academically talented student.

---

[4] Additional information is available from Superior and Talented Student Project, North Central Association, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois. J. Ned Bryan, former director of the STS Project is now with the Talent Development Project of the U.S. Office of Education. See his statement, "The Office of Education and Development of Talent," *School Life*, April 1962, p. 13–15.

Current practices and procedures in the education of the academically talented which were developed by the project include: Significant increase in grouping based on broader criteria, which include teacher judgment, student grades, achievement tests, and reading scores; repositioning of courses in accordance with indications of readiness; more effective diagnosis of intradifferences as indicated by standardized tests of intelligence and achievement; marked increase in number of Advanced Placement programs; supplemental teacher training in content areas independent of college and university credit but tied in with local certification and salary step placement; a master schedule which provides less emphasis on the quantitative Carnegie unit and more on the controlled flexibility design of variable size groups, time allocations, and team teaching; more frequent ungraded primary and intermediate grade organizations; some increase in the use of programed courses; the movement of content down, particularly in the areas of languages and mathematics, and the development of back-up courses in science, English, and social science; greater emphasis on teaching for creativity and productive thinking and less on conformity; greater use of machine procedures for reporting to parents, pupil attendance, and schedule making; limited use of lay readers, particularly in advanced placement courses in English; extension of the school year through summer programs; flexible progression which permits students to take some work in college simultaneously with completion of the twelfth grade in high school; and expansion of curriculum offerings in cooperation with college faculties on a bimonthly basis in areas of art, music, and political science.

There are examples, also, of programs designed to help the teacher broaden his own thinking, thereby contributing to his ability to deal with superior students. For example, the John Hay Fellows program is an effort to help teachers increase their general education in the humanities and their knowledge of their own subject.[6] The fellows are not candidates for degrees. There are no grades, no examinations, no credits. The purpose of the program is to encourage teachers to do the work for its own sake, to improve their understandings and outlooks as individuals, and thereby to improve their teaching.

---

[5] Additional information is available from Charles E. Bish, Director, NEA Project on the Academically Talented Student, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

The Course Content Improvement Program of the National Science Foundation is an example of efforts to improve programs in a particular cluster of related areas. The program supports cooperative ventures among college and university scholars, high school and elementary teachers of high quality, audiovisual experts, test experts, publishers, and others with appropriate special talents needed in the preparation of new course materials. A most intriguing result of this effort to produce new course materials is a growing agreement that the teaching of contemporary science must be based on an analytical, open-ended approach. It is believed that the stress must be on process rather than information since this is an age in which the total volume of scientific information is doubling every 8 to 10 years and in which 90 to 95 percent of the scientists who have ever lived are now alive.

Both the undergraduate research and the independent study programs of the NSF are aimed at the needs of the more able undergraduate majoring in science and are quite clearly in the area that is generally identified with departmental honors.[7] They are specifically concerned with bringing students into working contact with creative scholars. During next year, over 500 grants totaling about $4.5 million will provide support for about 7,000 undergraduates working in a variety of disciplines. The program is reported to be working well in developing scholarly ability among able undergraduates, but in some institutions the necessity for the student to choose between science subjects and professional education courses is a limiting factor in terms of the number of qualified teachers the program helps to produce.

In general, then, there is obviously a trend toward a quality emphasis at all levels of education; and institutions and organizations are working to find the best ways to implement it. Unquestionably, this emphasis upon quality may in itself help to attract superior students to the teaching profession, thereby adding to the momentum of the trend. The extent to which these students will choose to go into teaching will be influenced to a great extent by the career opportunities open to them, as we shall see in the next section.

---

[6] Additional information is available from Charles R. Keller, Director, John Hay Fellows Program, 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N.Y.

[7] A grant on July 27, 1962, of $89,100 to ICSS from National Science Foundation indicates its conscious concern with the educational role of honors programs in the sciences, the quantitative social sciences, and allied fields such as engineering and medicine. This grant is for investigation of and publication on four specific projects: (1) The value of research participation and independent study for the intellectual development of the student; (2) the teaching of science to non-science majors, particularly those in honors; (3) the meaning of "honors approaches" in laboratory exercises, sections, courses, situations; and (4) interdisciplinary approaches, particularly in honors, in the natural and social sciences.

Effect of Honors Programs on Recruitment and Retention of Teachers

> **Just as it is important for gifted children to have leisure and time to think, to plan, and to explore, so it is important for teachers to have time to think and to plan and some leisure time for personal and intellectual development and recreation.—Merle L. Borrowman, *University of Wisconsin***

Career opportunities, salary, and working conditions are crucial factors in attracting good teachers. The importance of each of these factors, of course, is relative to other opportunities in the area. In the high school at Oak Park, Ill., for example, there are levels in the salary schedule for those with the B.A. degree, the M.A., and the M.A. plus 30 hours. A regular classroom teacher reaches the top salary in about 14 or 15 years. In every 5-year period, the teacher is required to earn 6 hours of graduate, professional-growth credit. In the board's evaluation of this credit, however, writing, participation in professional organizations, committee work, or travel may be accepted in lieu of regular university courses. Relatively speaking, Oak Park is considered in a favored position compared with many other places in the country. Almost half of the staff are at the maximum in the salary scale, which is some indication of their satisfaction. The community is education-oriented, and it is not difficult to sell ideas to the community when they concern improvement of the schools. More than the average number of parents have been to college, and they give support and cooperation. The honors program, which extends throughout all the departments at Oak Park, is thought to be helpful in attracting teachers with qualifications superior to those who might have been attracted in years past.

Opportunities in the elementary and secondary field have become more and more favorable in recent years. There is not the minute scrutiny of personal lives that was characteristic in the past. Many of the extracurricular activities requiring teacher direction and supervision now involve salary adjustments to compensate for extra hours of service. In some States, the total pay compares favorably with that in the colleges. In a good elementary school today, the honors graduate might find real opportunity, either in teaching or in administration, equal to anything he might find in college work or in high school.

In general, the school system which has the greatest possibility of attracting superior students into teaching careers is one in which administrators are intellectually awake and have dynamic interest in the quality approach in the schools; where certification requirements and salary and placement practices favor progress over conformity; and where the individual teacher's capability, self-confidence, and self-respect are esteemed, not only by fellow teachers within a specific school but also by professional colleagues at the various educational levels and by the citizens of the community.

Economic Implications

> **The real question is whether or not we in this country are going to support our schools in such a way and to such an extent that there can be the right kind of working conditions for really excellent teaching and learning. . . . When we talk about real excellence in the schools, we are talking through our hats unless we are willing to invest a considerably greater amount than we do now.—J. W. Maucker, *State College of Iowa***

Provision of special programs for superior students must rest on fair assurance that the schools will have the kinds of working conditions that make it possible to carry on at an intellectual level consistent with honors work. Granted adequate support, the potentialities of such programs—indeed, of the whole of education—are unlimited. But the fact is that we as a Nation do not make ourselves invest enough in education. It is true that expenditures for education have more than doubled in the last 10 years, but we have not increased the proportion of our resources per pupil in that time. We are spending about 3.5 percent of our gross national product on formal education at all levels—elementary, secondary, higher education, public and private. This is up about half a percent in 10 years, but enrollments have risen equal to that. Many feel that we ought to double our national investment in education, and that we are not going to do a really better qualitative job until we recognize this squarely.

Scholars have a moral obligation to speak out for increased excellence and for adequate support to bring about the conditions conducive to this excellence. Until educators and scholars recognize the relationship between support for the schools and excellence, they cannot very well expect the public to see the relationship; and unless and until the public sees that relationship, they will not increase the investment in education.

Questions of great relevance are being raised about the talent loss among the economically and culturally handicapped.[8] What are the relationships, for example, between talent and income level and between motivation and family culture? What can be done to enhance the emergence of talent among the disadvantaged and to prevent the erosion of talent once it has been identified? Actually, programs for superior students should have no implications of elitism. The approach to the identification and development of the talents of superior students should also be effective in helping to raise the quality of education for the entire student body.

Education for superior students is not simply a continuous cycle starting with the identification and provision for talent at the elementary level and allowing for similar special programing at each successive school and college level, after which superior students become teachers of bright little ones. It is a matter of identifying talent at whatever level it emerges. In the North Central Association Superior and Talented Student Project, a deliberate attempt was made to initially identify schools that had a sizable pool of talented youngsters not being challenged. The project—now an interregional one—in working with secondary schools found that latent talent must be identified earlier in the life of the individual, particularly if he comes from an environment which does not positively value high academic achievement. Honors work in college may be too late for many of the youngsters who, with upgrading and lifting of the sights, may be among our ablest students.

Students who have had honors experiences in the colleges and universities should be able to go back into the secondary and elementary schools and identify other talented young people who do not come from environments likely to produce high motivation. They should be able to work in situations that do not yet have programs for talented students and help create the conditions in which such programs can flourish.[9] Given adequate support, there is no limit to the heights in education to which the quality approach can lead us.

---

[8] James Bryant Conant, *Slums and Suburbs,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961; Patricia Sexton, *Education and Income,* New York: Viking Press, 1961; and *Education and the Disadvantaged American,* Report of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1962.

[9] Hunter College recently received a grant from the Federal Government for a program to train teachers for schools in the slum areas.

V. Conclusions

We ought to think of honors programs more as a way of life and scholarship for students rather than as a particular mode of administrative organization. Through the honors approach, we must create conditions that make possible this way of life. This takes the focus off any particular kind of methodology and places it in a goal.—Lindley Stiles, *University of Wisconsin*

Compared to the granting of earned degrees "with honors," which has long been a relatively general practice among colleges and universities, the offering of "honors programs" is a relatively recent development. Indeed, more than half of the honors programs currently in use have been inaugurated during the last 10 years. Just as most innovations in education take hold slowly and gradually build momentum to the extent that they prove valuable, so it has been with honors programs and the honors approach. Although most honors programs have passed through much of the initial period of exploration, there is still no one crystalized, formalized conception of what is intrinsic in honors, whether in the liberal arts, in professional education, in other professional fields, or in the performing arts. Certainly, improved quality of learning by superior students is the one pervading purpose of honors programs; the conceptions of quality and of the methods of achieving quality are almost as varied as the institutions themselves.

While institutions must not lose their power to attract and challenge good minds by overstressing means and methods to the neglect of content, still they must find the best possible ways to break the academic lockstep in order for each student to progress as far and as fast as he can.[1] This purposive flexibility is important for all students, but it is especially vital for the gifted or superior student, whose development may not be challenged by programs designed for the average. Recommendations of ICSS regarding the major features of a full honors program have been given in the introductory statement of this publication. However, the inauguration of an honors program need not await full implementation of every recommended feature. It can be started in a small way and move in the direction of a full program as fast as is feasible in the institution.

---

[1] Charles C. Cole and Lanora G. Lewis, *Flexibility in the Undergraduate Curriculum*, Number 10 of the *New Dimensions in Higher Education series*, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, 57 p.

Special sections, special courses, and special provisions for independent study are typical of honors programs. Advanced placement and acceleration, where appropriate, contribute by helping the student to avoid unnecessary repetition, thereby leaving time for increasing the breadth, depth, and scope of his learning. Taken individually, the numerous practices in use by colleges and universities in dealing with superior students may or may not be part of an honors approach, depending upon a number of interrelated factors. It should also be acknowledged that the honors *approach* may be used with students whose work is not up to the quality normally required for honors, but care must be taken not to dilute the program by sacrificing substance for numbers. *A true honors program is directed toward that combination of approach and quality which leads the best students to do their best work.*

There is a general movement toward the quality approach, not only in colleges but in the elementary and secondary schools as well. This movement is giving American education a broad lift, not just one narrowly channeled toward an intellectual elite but one directed toward the recognition of the ability discoverable in all socioeconomic groups, with stress on values and goals wedded to knowledge. Already, the impact of emphasis upon quality in the elementary and secondary schools is leading to flexible progression at all levels and in some cases to the upgrading of entire courses or areas. In this way, there is avoidance of unnecessary repetition; and students are released for work appropriate to their greater readiness. Curriculum reforms in mathematics, sciences, foreign languages, and other areas are moving away from the mere accumulation of facts toward the complex approach which is typical of honors programs. To the extent that adequate financing is available, the honors approach is increasingly being extended to the regular program.

The profound implications of the teaching-learning process, which were earlier given attention by John Dewey and A. N. Whitehead, have more recently been raised by Jerome Bruner's report in *The Process of Education* and Nevitt Sanford's *The American College*. Honors work deals with knowledge, of course; but more than this it deals with the use of knowledge and the discovery and application of new knowledge. The honors approach to content and method is intended to give the student the kinds of experiences which will help him throughout life to make critical decisions and wise choices in the face of changing conditions, changing demands, and even changing knowledge.

The following statements, which combine conclusions and recommendations, have specific reference to honors programs but in many instances might well be applied to education in general.

1. The quality of our schools depends, in the last analysis, upon the quality of our teachers. Since teachers tend to teach as they have been taught, it is important that candidates for the teaching profession have the best possible learning experiences so that they, in turn, will be able to capitalize on those experiences in attempting to provide effective learning situations for their students. For this reason, institutions which prepare teachers should be encouraged to consider ways in which they can inaugurate programs with the honors approach. Initially, this should involve, as a minimum, honors *programs* for the best students. To the extent that the institution can finance such programs, the honors *approach* should be extended to other students as well.

2. Certainly, programs of honors quality can be an important part of the systematic recruitment of able and professionally promising students into the teaching profession as a first choice rather than as a last resort. Since the recruitment and training of able teachers is a function of each college or university as a whole, not just of the education faculty alone, members of all departments are urged to cooperate in the development of honors programs for teachers. This means that the work of the general honors program, the subject major, and the professional education courses should be sufficiently coordinated to create a sense of continuity in the honors experience of the student. The cooperative planning between faculty of subject disciplines and those of education contributes to fertile exploration of the methods, content, and goals of education.

3. Because education is a continuous process, there needs to be a partnership among teachers at the various levels so that college teachers know more about what and how students have learned in the schools from which they come and to which teacher candidates will return as teacher-scholars when they are ready for careers. Such partnerships are valuable in three important ways: They provide insights which contribute to improvement of the actual teaching-learning situations of teacher candidates throughout their college careers; they are useful in determining practices with regard to flexible progression and admission of students to honors programs; and they are necessary as background for effective advising of students.

4. The proportion of students in honors programs at any given college or university is likely to be a reflection of the overall admissions policy and the financial support which the institution is able to give to programs with the honors approach. If the threshold to honors

programs is made too low, in order to increase numbers, quality may suffer. Especially in the initial stages, it is better to err on the side of high selectivity, with a limited program to assure quality, than to risk mediocrity in an effort to accommodate large numbers of students.

5. Selection of students for honors programs is complicated by the the fact that women seem more mature than men at the beginning of college, although the number of men and women in the superior ranks is about equal by the senior year. There is need, therefore, not only for further study of problems related to criteria for admission of men and women students to freshman honors work but also for objective information to be used as a basis for realistic counseling of men and women honors students as they prepare for careers.

6. The quality of the learning experience itself depends upon the philosophy, the enthusiasm, and the skill of individual instructors, and upon their teamwork and dedication to the planning and implementation of the total program. Unless the program can be adequately budgeted, especially in terms of staff, it should not be undertaken with the expectation that it will then flourish. Yet there is always a reasonable prospect that an initial sacrifice of time by dedicated faculty may bring funds needed for continuation.

7. Honors programs have been and will continue to be proving grounds for many of the emerging practices through which teaching-learning experiences of all students are being improved. For this reason, agencies that provide funds for educational improvement should be encouraged to make grants for the development and evaluation of programs with the honors approach in order to supplement what the institutions themselves can afford to do. Futhermore, it is not enough simply to support programs of honors quality within the institutions preparing teachers; there must also be support within the elementary and secondary schools in order to attract and hold in teaching positions as many as possible of those bright young people who are able to identify emerging talent in rising generations and challenge and nurture its development.

8. Careful and objective appraisal needs to be made of experimental programs, and on a systematically recurring basis of established programs, first in terms of student response and achievement while in school and second with respect to the efficiency of the teachers produced. Such appraisals must take into consideration certain contributing factors. For example, to accommodate differences in learning rate, new measures of accomplishment are needed to supplement or replace the emphasis which the traditional credit hour places on time

spent in class;[2] and certification requirements need to be modified in some States to guarantee quality without imposing unnecessary restrictions through formal course requirements which limit the time students have for breadth and depth of study.

9. Regardless of the pattern which the honors program may take, advising of students makes a significant contribution to the honors climate or atmosphere. Responsibility for performance of the advising function should, therefore, be precisely established so that every honors student knows to whom he should go for the assistance he needs. Advisers of honors students in education find their work complicated by the fact that men who are in honors programs frequently look toward college teaching as a career, although there is an increasing demand for their services in elementary and high school positions. On the other hand, women in honors programs may be fully capable of teaching at the college level; but there is an open question about whether or not many should be urged to do so in view of the discontinuous nature of their careers and society's predilection toward placing them in teaching positions at the lower levels.

10. The ICSS is an effective channel of communication about practices used in programs of honors quality in higher education. Other channels include conferences, regional and national meetings, and the literature of such organizations as the American Council on Education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and regional accrediting associations, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, the National Education Association and its affiliate bodies, State teachers associations, the American Federation of Teachers and other independent teachers unions, the American Association of University Professors, the National Society of College Teachers of Education, and the U.S. Office of Education. Through the cooperative endeavors of members of the teaching profession, professional associations, and official agencies, programs of honors quality can be encouraged in order to insure maximum development and utilization of talent at all levels.

By doing the best possible job of educating and utilizing the talents of the best students, especially in teacher education, our Nation can ultimately raise education to new heights.

---

[2] Lanora G. Lewis, *The Credit System in Colleges and Universities*, Number 9 of the New Dimensions in Higher Education series. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. 1961. 37 p.

Appendix A. Conference Addresses

Between the Conception and the Act

E. W. Strong

Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley

I believe that we will find ourselves in general agreement on purpose to be consummated in seeking to develop honors work in the preparation of teachers and thence in the schools. General agreement may be less easy to reach on desirable ways and means of effectuating purpose. In considering what ought to be done and how to do it, we will need to keep feasibility in view throughout—the conditions without which success in the honors undertaking is not likely to be had. For it is not enough to be agreed on purpose and agreed on means of effectuating purpose. We can be agreed that we want to bake bread and that it takes yeast to make leavened bread. Do we have the yeast? If not, how may it be procured? It will not profit us to mix the dough if we cannot get the lump to rise. Our tasks, then, are not only those of exploring the ends to be sought and the means to those ends. We shall also be exploring the conditions requisite for mounting and sustaining honors work and honors programs.

Development of Honors Work

The most talented students are capable of the best work. The sooner they are identified and provided with opportunity to make ample use of their talents as they mature, the more they will encompass and master in the years they spend in formal education. It is the aim of honors work to enable the best students to do the best of which they are capable.

These best students differ in degree and not necessarily in kind of capabilities from their companions. So, too, the intellectual fare of students in an honors program differs in degree and not in kind from the fare of those who fall short of qualifying for honors. Some of those who have not amassed a grade-point average specified for admission to honors work will be more independent intellectually, more curious, creative, and searching than getters of high grades. Selection made on the basis of grade records alone will miss the mavericks coming to the attention of individual teachers. The student with a special flair, the bright noncomformist, the individual who lets grades fall where they may while he devotes his time and effort to the study that interests him most—such student tests the perspicacity of an honors director or an honors committee engaged in selecting participants in honors work. Though the differences between better and best are differences of degree and not of kind, a scaling that is applied mechanically, a selecting that does not assess each individual in depth will be defective in making qualitative discriminations.

An honors program rests on qualitative discriminations in selection of students, selection of faculty, and selection of particular modes of work. No department, school, or college would be in a position to undertake an honors program if it were not prepared to select and to do so effectively in respect to students, staff and instructional program. If, to attract excellent students and excellent teachers, an institution devises an honors program for which, initially, there is a lack of both excellent students and teachers, the laudable purpose is likely to falter and fail. If initially, the ground must be prepared before a more intensive cultivation is feasible, the honors' purpose sets an eventual goal to be reached and affords guidance in moving toward that goal. The first steps are then honors directed but are not yet in full measure pitched at the level of excellence that should be attained to be properly characterized by the name of honors.

An example may serve to make more explicit the situation with which I am here concerned. An institution wants to do better than it has done in the educational opportunities afforded its most capable students. Its admission and performance requirements are such that the spectrum between the most capable and the least capable students is quite wide. With large numbers of students enrolled distributed over courses of instruction, these courses have had to be held to a middle-of-the-range level of competence. The best students have thereby not been well served. Indeed, it may be the case that more attention and time have been devoted to the marginal students than to superior students, simply because the latter have done well in grades even though they are working considerably below their capabilities. In view of such a situation, the college decides, under the name of an honors program, to enroll the top 25 percent of its student body in courses of instruction reserved for this group. Thereby it will be upgrading the work done by the students in this quartile. It will not yet have exercised the selection which differentiates the highly gifted student from the above average student. Only as this selection is made do we arrive at the qualitative discrimination which sets off doing better with better students from doing the best with the best. The latter is the conception of honors that many colleges and universities are now adhering to in their honors programs.

The concern to do better with the upper 25 percent of the students is thoroughly commendable. It may even be imperative in paving the way for a further selectivity. An honors program has more chance of coming to fruition at an apex of highly selected students few in number in proportion to total enrollment, to the extent that it gains reinforcement by improved quality in courses open to a larger proportion. Unless there is support below a summit, an attempt to work from the top down is not likely to thrive. Either needed support is lacking in the work undertaken outside of honors courses, or else the honors program has to encompass many more courses than can be financed by an institution along with its regular courses of instruction.

Each institution of higher education will need, in its concern for excellence, to size up what it is in a position to do in becoming more selective of a portion of its students to which members of the faculty are assigned in a special program. There is no conflict of purpose in selecting the top one-quarter and then subsequently (or even concurrently if the situation is favorable) making a more exacting selection of five percent or less. What honors represents to the students and the faculty engaged, however, will be materially affected by what is embraced and what is not embraced under that designation. One institution's inclusion, if broad, will not be comparable with another's that has been quite limited.

Moreover, if the student body within which a percentile proportioning into honors has been put into effect is one which has been selected already by high admission standards, this factor must also be taken into account in making comparisons. The University of California, for example, has now reduced admissions to the top 12.5 percent of the high school graduates. Were a 4-year honors program to be established, the students beginning the program in their freshman year would fall in the top one or two percent of the high school graduates. Put another way, if 10 percent of the top 12.5 percent constituted the freshman honors group, several hundred freshmen would be eligible for honors. Indeed 400 entered last fall at Berkeley who had honors at entrance, that is, high school records which consisted of not more than one B grade, the remainder being straight A's.

Whatever be the position in which an institution finds itself, it will have a complement of students which are its most capable to whom that institution can properly devote special attention. In so doing, it will soon recognize that its concern does not begin with these students at the time of entrance but reaches down into the high schools and, beyond that, into the elementary schools. The recognition brings to the fore a vital role that departments, schools and colleges of education have in their preparation of teachers for these lower schools. If those engaged in teacher preparation have not brought their own best-qualified students into honors work, they will not be furnishing a cadre of teachers who will carry the conception of honors into the schools to bring it there to fruition in practice.

The honors idea can be imparted to many by way of definition, specification, or description of what is meant when we speak of gifted students and special programs. To work effectively, however, with the most gifted students in English, mathematics, science, history, or other disciplines calls for teachers who have equipped themselves to challenge the minds of these students and to meet the challenges that they present.

If students enroll in a school of education for teacher training after they have completed work for the A.B. degree in a liberal arts college within which they have done honors work, the school is in a position to capitalize on this. If the school does not do so, it can expect dissatisfaction from the students. In colleges within which undergraduates preparing to teach in high schools and the elementary schools complete a major in education, there should be opportunity for honors work, at least in the senior year and, preferably, beginning earlier. Honors work that calls fully upon the intellectual resources of the student of exceptional ability develops in that student as teacher a fuller capability to repeat the process with his students.

Furthermore, it is reasonable to expect that engagements of prospective teachers with honors will wed more of them to teaching, for honors work is the antithesis of a routine performance of routine chores. Honors work is the work of inquiry to which teacher and student contribute. It fosters and develops skill in examining the answers given to questions by demanding evidence and reasons. It leads to examinations of the questions themselves and of the kinds of answers that are relevant to a scientific question, a moral or aesthetic question, a question about validity of reasoning, a question about truth or falsity of a proposition, a question about definition as distinguished from a question about causation, a question about facts and a question about interpretation of facts. Such examining ought *never* to be conceived as something reserved for honors work or peculiar to it, but such examining ought *always* to be characteristic of the work of students and teachers in an honors program.

With the best students and the best teachers, breadth and depth of inquiry will thrive best; but in the continuum of the educables and the educators there is no point at which we are justified in treating learning as merely a matter of rote in turning out ready-made answers to stock questions. The acquisition of skills of mind requires application and hard work, a doing and redoing necessary to the formation of habits in reading, writing, and reasoning. To be skillful and knowledgeable in the play of ideas, exacting practice is demanded. The person who wants to be a creative writer must first learn how to write by working at it.

For the ablest students, the tasks with which others have to struggle are easier to perform. Time and again, the greater labor expended carries the less gifted student further in accomplishment and in subsequent career than his more gifted companion. The fault lies with the more gifted student if he is lazy; but the fault lies with the schools insofar as they demanded too little and offered too little to their bright and restless students.

Within colleges and universities today we are becoming increasingly concerned with sorting out students on the basis of their capabilities for the sake of providing opportunities best suited to ability groupings. Thereby the institutions in this country are seeking to do something that has never been done hitherto in this or any other land. They are seeking to provide higher education for the many while, at the same time, placing an emphasis on excellence. To make higher education available to large numbers of students, a society must do what it can to furnish equality of opportunity. In recognition of inequality of capability, we have also the task of selecting the ablest students and advancing them as fast and as far as we can. Only if there is not enough financial support of education to permit both tasks—the task of educating the many and the task of devoting special effort to the very best—are we then faced with having to sacrifice one to the other undertaking. Given the means, there is no conflict or incompatibility between the end of educating the many and of serving highest excellence by providing the best for the best.

The present conjoint serving of two ends by the institutions of higher learning in the United States has only gradually come to realization. Down to the Civil War, the colleges and universities in this country drew their students from a relatively small segment of the population. An intellectual elite, represented in clergymen, doctors, lawyers, teachers, men of letters, and men of affairs flowed from these centers. In the Morrill Act of 1862, the Congress provided for the establishment of land-grant institutions in every State in the Union. Agriculture and the mechanical arts became subjects of instruction made available to students in State-supported colleges and universities. In the University of California, as in the other land-grant institutions, colleges of agriculture and of engineering became segments incorporated within a whole composed of a liberal arts college, professional schools, and graduate instruction. Today, the great majority of students are enrolled in courses of study leading to the bachelor of arts degree and, of these, increasing numbers go on to graduate work. The influx of students into colleges and universities after World War I and the current surge which will continue throughout this decade constitute, in numbers represented, the phenomenon commonly designated as "mass education." It should not be assumed or concluded that the press of numbers has been at the expense of quality by descent to a mass-mediocrity. Private institutions of high excellence, under necessity to hold enrollments within the limit of their financial resources, have become more selective in their admissions. At no earlier time in this century have their student bodies been of higher excellence. The publicly supported institutions, by a hierarchical distribution of tasks and responsibilities, can match the best private institutions at one end of the ability-range while, at the same time, extending educational opportunity broadened out to a wide base.

Ways and Means of Furthering Honors Work in Schools of Education

The general question to be raised is the following: Are there, in the tasks which fall to a school of education in the preparation of secondary and elementary school teachers, certain features or characteristics pertaining to its professional orientation which call for ways and means of developing honors work somewhat different from those appropriate to honors in a liberal arts college?

This general question introduces an array of more particular questions. Should different criteria of selection of students, of courses, or of faculty be used? Should the honors program of the school be a continuation (or extension) of honors work done earlier in the liberal arts college? What does an honors program in a school of education need to encompass to recruit able students for teaching careers? Should the school seek to be highly selective in admission of students to honors or should it seek to bring a substantial number of students into the fold? What kinds of courses should be included in the program, and what would constitute the differentiating characteristics of these courses in comparison with regular courses? Should honors courses in education be developed, where possible to do so, on an interdisciplinary basis? What courses should be of an interdisciplinary nature and what courses should be fully the responsibility of the faculty in education? Should there be somewhat different content, emphasis, or reach in honors work undertaken by students preparing themselves to teach in the high schools and by students preparing themselves to teach in elementary schools? Given the competition for grades and the more exacting demands of honors work, what will induce students well qualified for honors work to elect it? Or, putting this question another way, how are conditions established that will dispose both students and faculty to participate in honors work? Looking to end-results—the flow into the schools of teachers who have been student-participants in honors—what are the measures or tests we should use in evaluating the effective worth of their honors preparation?

These are some of the questions we are met to discuss. As my initial contribution to the discussion, I want to examine the couching of these questions. In so doing, I will advance suggestions, hypotheses, and considerations which appear to me to be ingredient to practicable and desirable solutions of problems insofar as problems are presented by the question. Not every question poses a problem, unless it be the problem of sifting out a question that embodies a genuine doubt or difficulty from a question that does not.

All of us recognize that, as work in a particular field of study reaches an advanced level, it takes on a professional character. A student with a major in history, English, or philosophy reaches this level as he approaches or enters upon graduate study to equip himself to be a contributor in his chosen field. As a teaching assistant or teaching fellow he gains apprenticeship experience in the classroom. In seminars, he is expected to perform as a junior colleague in presentation and discussion of research papers. There is no break in a continuity of study begun as an undergraduate and becoming more thorough and specialized during the graduate years. There is a movement from breadth to depth, a movement towards concentration for the sake of developing a mastery as required and judged by experts. In small seminars and in the final stage during which the student works individually in close collaboration with one or more members of the faculty in the conduct of his research, relationships are established between student and teacher of the kind sought also in undergraduate honors.

The situation does not seem to me to be in any way radically dissimilar in professional schools and colleges with undergraduate curriculums. The engineering student or student in architecture has fewer electives during his undergraduate years and encompasses less in breadth of study in the social sciences and the humanities. Not until his junior year will most of his courses be taken within the professional department. Participation in honors work—whether it be in a campus-wide honors program, or in a program developed within the professional school or college, or in some combination, or by some moving over from general to departmental programs—will be animated by purposes in common even though somewhat different emphases are expected to be lodged in the particular disciplinary clusterings of students. These do not necessarily constitute a weakness and may indeed be a strength, especially in the third, fourth, and fifth undergraduate years.

Turning to schools of education in their tasks of preparing teachers, the tasks have generally been viewed as threefold in nature. First, these schools must see to it that those who are to teach in elementary schools or in secondary schools have gained a good competence in the subjects they are to teach. Second, they seek to provide an understanding of the learning process through psychological study, of the educational enterprise through study of the history and philosophy of education, and of the school in society through comparative studies. Third, they seek through methods courses and practice teaching to develop teaching skills to have these be exercised effectively. The latter two tasks presuppose the first.

In entering upon an honors program, are all three endeavors as represented in course-credit work suited for inclusion in that program? The first two appear to me to be entirely suitable for development of honors sections, honors colloquia, tutorials, honors theses, and interdisciplinary collaboration. I am puzzled to see how the last could or should be incorporated.

I have no doubt that a portion of the teachers being prepared will be found to be of superior ability and promise with respect to performance in classroom teaching. This will not be just a matter of a superior grade-point record but will also have to do with character, personality traits, devotion to teaching, ability to challenge students and to communicate with them, zest, patience, and insight. The source of my puzzlement does not lie here. It lies instead in the nature and role of practice teaching and of the courses in supervised teaching that are adjoined to this. Having gathered into a colloquium the most gifted prospective teachers, what would then be the honors work to be undertaken with respect to courses in the supervised teaching category? I am not here raising a question about need for or usefulness of these courses in the preparation of teachers. I am asking only if they are of a kind to lend themselves to honors work. In being devoted to achieving greater breadth and greater depth of inquiry, understanding, and appreciation, the work in honors should always be substantively lodged. It is so lodged in courses, seminars, colloquia, and tutorials or individual studies developed with respect to the first two tasks in an honors dimension. It appears to me not to be so lodged with respect to the third task as this is carried out in courses of supervised teaching.*

If these courses are set aside as falling outside an honors program, I would then hold that the first two tasks do not embody any features or characteristics which call for ways and means of developing honors work in a school of education that would differ markedly from the ways and means appropriate in a liberal arts college. I would qualify this in at least one important respect. The development of a professional *esprit de corps* among teacher candidates, especially those of highest purpose, ideals, scholarly grasp, and teaching effectiveness, will be a leavening influence within schools of education and in the elementary, secondary, and collegiate institutions in which the individuals will subsequently do their teaching. The influence, I suppose, would also be exerted upon and within supervised teaching (arts of practice), stimulated by, and responsive to, a qualitative lift imparted by honors to professional practice.

Thus far I have indicated how I would answer the general question—the question asking whether or not the professional orientation of a school of education calls for ways and means of developing honors work differing substantially from the conduct of honors in a liberal arts college. My answer was in the negative. If an honors program has already been instituted on a campus and if participation, continuation, or extension of that program is being sought by or within a school of education, then the motif should be *more of the same work of inquiry*. This "more of the same" could well be toward greater depth where, earlier, the students had done honors work in breadth. To attract these ablest students, a school of education must offer to them a like kind of intellectual engagement. An easy but fatal mistake would be made if one substituted exposition of honors work for the *doing* of honors work. The exposition could consist of courses entitled "Principles of honors work," "Theory and practice of honors," "The honors curriculum," "Criteria and methods of identifying and selecting the superior student," "History and philosophy of ability groupings," and so on. Such courses might or might not be, in the way in which they engaged the students in the work undertaken and in their substance and quality, of the kind and calibre deserving the name of honors work. They will not be this if they are didactic discourses about honors. The king who wanted geometry delivered to him was properly told, "Sire, there is no royal road to mathematics." Honors cannot be taught, even though attention can profitably be given to ways and means of developing honors work.

A school of education might not develop its honors courses on an interdisciplinary basis or by interdisciplinary collaboration; but unless the courses are of a kind suitable for, or suited to, such interdisciplinary development, they are not the right kind of courses. Each faculty member participating in an honors program will bring to the work he does in that program his own fund of interest and knowledge. Thus a member of the education faculty conducting an honors course in which the students are teacher candidates will have a double interest. There will be the interest in so conducting the course as to have it embody and exemplify performance of higher quality. At the same time, the particular composition of the group introduces the further profitable task of self-analysis in appraising the performance. In doing this, the students preparing themselves to be teachers and looking forward to work with superior students in elementary and secondary schools become engaged in measuring and testing the worth of such work.

---

*The position taken here by Mr. Strong was discussed at length during the conference. In order to present both sides of the debate, the verbatim transcript of this discussion is given as Appendix B.

It is surely desirable to have an increasing number of teachers in the schools who know what honors work is by having done it themselves. If the threshold into honors is lowered to increase numbers, quality will suffer. Since it will take excellent quality in an honors program in its staffing and content to draw excellent students to it, I believe it would be a mistake not to be highly selective, even though the numbers enrolled in the program are initially very small. Well begun will help insure best done thereafter. Moreover, recruitment of faculty for participation in honors work is most likely to prosper where the demand for quality is pitched high. Like will attract like. The time and energy that will need to be devoted by the participants in working with superior students in an honors program cannot be had from them by way of addition to an already full stint over any considerable period. Unless the program can be budgeted to provide for the proportion of time devoted by a faculty member to honors, the program should not be undertaken with the hope that it will then flourish. It might be undertaken by an initial sacrifice when there is a reasonable prospect that its results will bring to it the funds that are needed for continuation.

We cannot afford to do less than the best for the best students. Lest we be accused that this is an article of faith rather than a proposition proved by results, every honors program should be so mounted as to provide measures and tests of its efficacy. Embracing the purpose and devising the ways and means of effectuating the purpose residing in honors programs, we shall want to know the fruits of our labors. In education, as in other human enterprises, fads and fashions can exercise a sway which sweeps well-intentioned and initially well-conceived efforts to extremes that we have afterwards to repent and repair. Recognizing that programs bearing the name of honors carry with them an honorific connotation, we must be vigilant to have this be fully deserved. For if we have not honored honors by doing the qualitative job that is signified by the name, our zeal will have been misspent and we will be convicted of doing only lip-service in this cause. Between the conception and the act falls the shadow if we do not supply the substance. It is our task to supply the substance.

The Threat of Honors

JAMES L. JARRETT

President, Western Washington State College

The title of my talk is, of course, a bit of a trick. When Joe Cohen asked me what I was going to talk about, and I told him, he said, "Fine, sounds interesting." Then he did the second take: "Threat of honors?" he growled. "What's *that* about?"

Still and all, I think the concept "threat" will enable me to unify or at least to yoke together with minimum violence a string of cautionary remarks about honors programs. Those of us who are true believers like to get together on occasions like this to testify in behalf of the gospel according to us. We listen politely, if impatiently, and a little incredulously, to the testimony of others, in order to be able to tell how we manage the matter in our own parish. But there are heathens, and there are pitfalls. Let us take heed.

I remember with a certain acerb clarity the first occasion in which I, flushed with achievement, reported to a group of high school principals that at our college we had at last launched a small but altogether genuine honors program for those in the upper few percent of our freshman class. I concluded my speech with the justified expectation that, even if my rhetoric had limped, my message had had sufficient brilliance to shine through, and that I would now enjoy a small parade of congratulations. But it soon became clear that the parade had turned down another street. What I heard, instead of applause, was a reserved silence, broken only by some distinctly sour remarks. Even more characteristic, however, was this comment on the part of one principal: "This is all very well, to provide for that little elite, but what about the good average student? What are you doing for him?"

Now this is not necessarily an unfair question. It must be admitted that it is theoretically possible for a college with a heterogeneous student population unfairly to neglect the weaker students. One sometimes gets the impression that the larger public universities, in those States where the sons and daughters of all taxpayers are deemed admissible, tend, in sheer desperation, to become ruthless, hardening their hearts to the tune of an actuarial fife, to drum out, term after term, the hordes of the proven unfit. However, even if there be such dispensers of icy justice, surely the typical story is far otherwise, with batteries of counselors, psychological and otherwise, reading clinics, remedial courses, special tutoring services, elaborate warning systems, and even a prevailing belief among the arrangers of lower division programs that the primary challenge is to find a group of courses, *any* group of courses, that the weaker student can pass. We all know that considerable amount of faculty ingenuity is squandered on this task, and by no means entirely in behalf of athletes.

We know, too, that provision for an honors program does not normally mean robbing slow Peter to pay bright Paul. We tend to believe that an honors program tones up the whole establishment, but it is not my principal purpose here and now to say this. For one thing, it does not need saying to those who attend this kind of conference; for another, I am mainly interested in our looking squarely in the eye of the opposition, of the unconvinced.

Now, I believe that this dubiety concerning favored treatment for the bright is especially to be encountered among public school administrators and teachers, who are used to the compulsory education of all, frequently with a minimum of grouping, lest some be stigmatized as second class citizens. The argument is familiar to us all, but its familiarity, perhaps even its banality, should not blind us to the fact that this is the working creed of a significant number of educators.

I recently became aware of a widely used teacher placement form that provided for the marking of nearly every imaginable characteristic except intellectuality and academic excellence. This is not entirely an accident. There is still a widespread suspicion of the intellectual and bright elementary and secondary teacher. Like the highly gifted pupil, he may be an articulate critic of the establishment.

But it goes beyond the public schools (where, of course, it is not the unanimous opinion); it is present in our colleges and universities, too. It may be indigenous there, or it may come from the public schools. Let us not forget that professional educators are *unusually* sensitive to the winds blowing from the elementary and secondary schools—far more so than is commonly recognized outside these ranks. If a high school principal gets uneasy about a college honors program, a college professor of secondary school administration shifts in his seat.

This, then, is a threat. Honors programs threaten a certain group strongly egalitarian by tradition and possibly a little suspicious of the high IQ students and the intellectuals, especially if they are a little unruly. The oft-told story of the teacher who boasted that by the end of the year she usually managed to speed up the very slow and to slow down the very fast borrows its slightly grim humor from a prevailing practice. We are more accustomed to locating anti-intellectuals among other segments of the economy, but we will, to our peril, ignore their presence in the school and colleges.

A second group who may react to a certain threat in a proposed or an existent honors program are the college administrators charged with making the books balance. The point is simple, and I shall not try to complicate it. Honors programs, if they are much good, are expensive. Right now, there is, though we superstitiously avoid recognizing the fact in public, an unprecedented degree of affluence in higher education. But it is possible, even for one not constitutionally gloomy, to foresee distinct possibilities of harder sledding ahead. When this happens, when, that is, instead of another sizable increase in our appropriations or in our endowment funds, there suddenly develops a shrinkage, the costliness of honors programs will become more apparent. At that point it will become necessary to defend them, not as the cherry on an already rich sundae, but as a necessary mineral in the educational diet.

Even before this happens, the faculty may be threatened by an honors program, when such is endorsed in principle, even with enthusiasm and flourish, but with no adequate allowance made for its staffing. At my college, we did ask the faculty, or rather the faculty asked of itself, to take on honors courses as overload for a one-quarter trial period. Then we moved into a partial underwriting of the program for the first full year, and now we have made what I believe is a fair allowance for participation in colloquia, tutorials, and the administration of the program. A faculty or administration contemplating an honors program may be well advised realistically to plan ahead against the threat of honors as just overload.

The students, too, may feel threatened by an honors program, and here I have in mind bright students who are, as they may in these days be well advised to be, grade-conscious. How often does it happen, I wonder, that a highly promising student decides not to enter the program because of a fear, possibly even justified, that his grades may suffer thereby. The answer, I take it, lies in guarding against any inflexible employment of a normal curve which by definition does not apply to abnormals. But, as in so many activities, it is not sufficient just to do the thing; one must also give adequate publicity to the thing done. Potential honors students, who are, I take it, not forced to enter the program, must realize that the usual grades in honors classes are A's and B's, and that the consistent C student there is probably misplaced.

I have mentioned four groups who may, and who upon occasion do, regard honors as a threat: a certain group of educators whom I mainly associate with public schools, college administrators who are willy-nilly budget-minded, faculty members for whom participation in the program is a serious overload, and students who worry about grades. I should like now to raise my eyebrows at three practices which I think may be said to threaten the quality of honors programs themselves, unless they are kept in mind and properly accounted for.

First, I should mention the kind of honors program which is created more by schedule makers than by imaginative designers. The practice is even more familiar in establishing so-called general education programs. You know, one simply checks off a number of existent courses listed in the catalog and then says, any two of this group, 12 hours in that, and either X, Y, or Z. This saves all the trouble of interdepartmental collaboration, and courses prepared especially in the interest of general education. One can also offer, say, American studies programs in this way. One already does teach American history and American literature, possibly American philosophy too, and of course, American government. Two pages in the catalog are a small price to pay for bunching these current offerings into what gets announced as a new program in American studies. Similarly, an institution perhaps a little self-conscious about not having an honors program, or a little cramped for money, time, or energy to create a program, may fabricate one with the help of scissors and pastepot. But a program that is nothing more than a series of earmarked sections from multisection courses can be called honors only by courtesy.

My second point is one I announce with some temerity and certainly with uncertainty. However, I'd like to register my impression that in our selections processes, the ways in which we identify the students admissible to the program, we may sometimes overdo "potentiality." Of course we may overemphasize grade-point averages, too, in high school or college, as indication of probable success in honors, but the dull A student is perhaps better recognized than the unintellectual student of high IQ. I certainly do not want to give the impression that I underestimate the power of honors to awaken the intellectual interests of the gifted-but-lethargic, but I sometimes feel that a word needs to be said for the student who is, by the usual measures, not *quite* as bright as the brightest—yet who gives evidence of that genuine interest in ideas that marks the conduct of every good honors program I have encountered. When the competition is severe for admission to the program, I would urge that demonstrated intellectuality be given full marks.

A third point concerns the format of honors colloquia and tutorials. Not long ago I expressed to our honors director my wonder about whether, with every colloquium leader devising long, long lists of reading for the youngsters, we might be teaching them to forget how to read *slowly*. I mean, of course, how to read painstakingly, word by word, instead of just getting more practice in that also valuable art of judicious skipping. Maybe there ought always to be provided one or two colloquia where intensive, rather than extensive, reading is required, where one book or maybe even one essay, one short story, one poem, is taken apart and reassembled with loving and meticulous care.

These are my three threats to optimal quality of the honors program itself. Others could, of course, be mentioned. For instance, there is the serious matter of inadequate attention paid to the selection of the honors teaching staff. However, I would like to conclude with a different kind of problem, one which I have seldom heard mentioned. I refer to the place of honors in professional education itself. I do not mean, now, just in the subject-matter major or minor of the teacher education student, but in the professional part of his preparation. I will confess that I am not as impressed as I once was with the role of the liberal arts snob, the one who, whatever his own teaching practice might indicate to the contrary, loudly affirms his belief that all those and only those who concentrate their full attention on their subject matter specialization become good teachers. I think I am well acquainted with the weaknesses of the usual education courses and I deplore them as much as anybody. But I wonder if this does not constitute a special challenge for honors. How can we seriously deny that there are immensely complex and immensely important questions—ranging from learning theory to school organization, from history of education to methods of evaluation, from the methods of teaching elementary arithmetic, which we have lately learned to be an amazingly sophisticated subject, to philosophy of education, altogether too often an amazingly naive and empty subject?

Programs in professional education for the highly gifted teachers-to-be may well save some of them from leaving their chosen career, may provide models for upgrading the entire professional sequence for teachers, and may—just think of it—*may* make better teachers of those who can stand the pace. I have concluded, perhaps by cheating, with a promise rather than a threat.

Oases of Excellence

LINDLEY STILES

Dean, School of Education, University of Wisconsin

Honors programs for prospective teachers can become oases of excellence in the dry and strife-torn deserts of teacher education. If they are well-designed and properly carried out, they can become invitations to teaching to the most outstanding young people, the people with the keenest minds, who are the most concerned about doing something worthwhile with their lives, some of whom have heretofore shunned the profession. They can also lead to the improvement of teacher education itself.

The objective of honors programs is twofold: first, to provide work in teacher education that is intellectually exciting and challenging to bright students; and, second, to produce teachers who are personally and professionally prepared to carry the banner of excellence to elementary and secondary schools.

Honors programs require a high degree of cooperation on an institution-wide basis between professors of education and professors in other schools, particularly in the liberal arts—professors in those fields that provide the major and minor specialized work. Institutions that do not have this are not going to be able to provide the kind of synchronization that has been discussed at this conference. Fortunately, we have made rapid strides in moving toward cooperation in many institutions. Within the last 5 years, over 200 institutions have introduced honors courses. This is rapid and dramatic progress. Already about a score of these are doing something about honors programs for teachers. This means that we are beginning to add the dimension of honors to the pedagogical phase of teacher education. I think this is the key. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Strong that we have to prove that we can apply honors to the laboratory phase of the work. My own inclination is to place this phase in a fifth-year program.

Although we are talking about dry and strife-torn deserts, I want to say that pedagogy is not entirely responsible for all of the dryness in these deserts of teacher education, even though it has been made the sole scapegoat of disrespect and sometimes of contempt. We have had brilliant young people who became teachers in the past, but their general education and their specialization in subject fields has often been woefully deficient. Not all teachers practice what they teach, even the gifted ones. Composition teachers do not write; history teachers are not historians; science teachers are not scientists; and foreign language teachers by and large are not necessarily good ambassadors for the cultures that they represent for students. You find exceptions to this indictment in a few fields—and at times in all fields. Often you find exceptions in fields such as art and music. But the truth is that programs of teacher education, even when they deal with able young people, are not producing for elementary and secondary schools enough teachers who are highly creative and productive scholars. Nor are bright teachers always the best examples of citizens or professional leaders. Too often they are immobilized by academic traditions, fettered by fear of change and experimentation, and submerged in a conformity to group rites and rituals. Courses in pedagogy, whatever their shortcomings, cannot be blamed for weaknesses in programs for teacher education that such behaviors reflect.

This is by way of saying that, as we build honors programs for teachers, we should, along with colleagues throughout our institutions, take a long look at the total honors program, not only at that in education. I know that a lot of us will be content just to have something we call an honors program, but honors programs have to produce *results*—both while the student is in school and after he graduates.

Elementary Teachers

One of the hardest problems will be providing honors works for students preparing to teach in elementary schools. In most of our institutions, we do not really give a college education to these people. Bright majors in elementary education, for example, do not carry academic programs that qualify them for membership in Phi Beta Kappa, and their methods courses are typically pitched far too close to the grade level for which they are being prepared. A heavy emphasis is placed on the actual performance of such elementary school skills as handwriting, arithmetic, geography, children's literature, arts and crafts, children's songs, games, folk dances, and nature study. This is what we call the "professionalized content."

Most of the criticism of teacher education or pedagogy today comes from elementary majors who are insulted by this kind of emphasis in their college programs. Such content can hardly be expected to appeal to bright students, usually women who yearn for the intellectual excitement of rigorous college-level courses that deal with substantive ideas, issues, values, and knowledge. As one student said to me, "It's quite a change to expect a student to make papier-mâché animals in one class and then go to a class in philosophy the next hour." This is wrong. Honors courses in pedagogy can correct this long-standing insult to the intelligence of prospective teachers by assigning for college study content that is intellectually challenging. This ought to be done for all students, but we should do it for the bright students. I submit to you that there is no way of making a course in children's literature a study in depth for a bright student. Familiarity with skills, subject matter, and activities appropriate for elementary school pupils—a necessity for successful teaching, to be sure—might better be allocated to the internship when prospective teachers are giving full time to learning how to teach. Mr. Strong has challenged us to tell him how we can make honors work out of this activity.

Women

Study needs also to be given to the appropriate uses of female talents in the field of education. Over the years there has been a steady decline in the proportion of high school teachers who are women, and a further decline is found in the use of women in school administration. The number of women holding high school principalships has diminished now almost to zero, and a decline at the elementary school level is also taking place. If you study the data now available about the development and use of the talents of woman in our society, you discover that fewer women are now preparing for professions than 15 years ago, and this includes teaching. Teaching comes closer to holding its own with the ratio of women in it, but in almost every other field the number of women is dropping. Are the girls going to have to get out their bloomers and hatchets again to reclaim their rightful status in the world of education? Certainly honors programs will have to face up not only to providing intellectually challenging programs of study for women, but helping to determine how these talents will be used in the profession after they have been developed and made available.

Programs of college study for women, particularly for women who are preparing to teach and who are bright, should give serious consideration to the ways in which women should be educated. In this age of space and science, for example, are women being introduced appropriately to such subjects as mathematics, astronomy physics, and chemistry? I know that elementary school teachers by-pass mathematics and science almost completely, or they take a course such as Mathematics for Teachers. These are the greatest insults of all, suggesting as they do that teachers are not smart enough to study mathematics.

Next Steps

Now I want to talk about the next steps that should follow from this conference. I do not know how you feel, but I feel that this conference is one of the most exciting things that has ever happened in the field of teacher education. Here we are coming out forthrightly and saying that we want the best young people in teaching, something our society has never said before. From Benjamin Franklin's time right down, no one had the courage to say "We want the best as teachers." This conference is the first time that a group of teacher-educators has gotten together to say, "Can we plan programs that attract and prepare those who are the best qualified for teaching to become the best kind of teachers?" It seems to me that it is important that before we go away from this meeting we as a group visualize the steps that will carry the seeds of this conference all over the Nation, so that we can set up these oases of excellence in teacher education and thereby bring water to the desert that needs so much to flower if our schools are to do their job.

Evaluation

Honors programs are going to have to be appraised carefully and objectively, so that we know whether or not they are doing the job that we expect when we set them up.. They must be appraised first of all in terms of student response and achievement while they are in college. I sometimes think that our appraisal of teaching is done pretty much on the basis of how it *feels*. I'm not quite a Diogenes—I don't even have a lantern, but I do look around for evidence that suggests that something is better than something else in this business of teaching. I've been looking the last 2 or 3 years for evidence about whether or not team teaching is better than the self-contained classroom teaching. You ought to see how we appraise it by feel. The reports say, "We've had team teaching going now for 2 or 3 years, and everybody likes it—the kids like it, the teachers like it, and the parents don't complain very much. We think it's pretty good." That's by feel. Well I think we're going to have to appraise honors programs more than just by feel. We have to appraise them by how much people learn and by the calibre of teachers that they produce.

Certification Requirements

We must make sure that anyone who comes through an honors program can be certified without embrassment or without a lot of letters written back and forth. Don't blame your problems on your State superintendent of public instruction. He's doing just exactly what he's been told to do. His program of certification is exactly what the people in his State, including those in the profession—the pedagogues and a few of the academic boys—have said he ought to do. Certification requirements, in effect, reflect the pressures that have been exerted on State departments of public instruction. As a consequence, they are often a hodgepodge of specific and unbalanced specifications that prohibit rather than guarantee that the States have good teachers.

Here's what I suggest: This group and others concerned with honors programs for teachers must ask State departments to set up machinery for accrediting or certifying people who come through honors programs. It's not very difficult to do. We are making rapid improvements in certification patterns. If you can get a teacher certified on the basis of examinations, as we've done in Wisconsin, you can get them certified on the basis of work in an honors program.

We must see to it that honors programs are fully understood by school officials, so that when we turn out bright teachers in an honors program their placement will be appropriate to their capacities. This means working with the administrators so that they know how to use these talents once we have developed them. And we must work with the profession itself—the various guilds and associations and all of the organizations to which teachers belong—to see that they support honors programs. This may not be easy to achieve.

Pitfalls

There is a real danger that honors programs will simply provide greater freedom for students and professors to cover the same content without achieving new educational goals. In effect, honors programs may become only bypasses to established courses in teaching methods that lead a student by a different route to the same destination on the highway of learning, without pushing him either significantly further down that highway or helping him to build a new and better road for his life's education. This is a danger.

I think that the pedagogues will have something to face up to on this, because we've been so certain about what ought to be taught that we've got it written into State law. We'll find ourselves setting up honors courses that just take the place of some course that's required by law, instead of saying that the honors student is bright enough to learn the material in a summer by reading a few books and should be pushed beyond the required content into some other courses.

There is danger that we may assume that the job of honors programs is to accelerate bright students rather than to improve their skills and expand their knowledge—to educate them better.

Another pitfall is that we may miss the creative students because, as you know, creativity and what we call intelligence are not highly correlated.

I shudder with fear that we are going to have designs for honors courses that become rigid and traditional to the extent that after the first flush of novelty wears off they will be just as sterile, confining, and stultifying to students as regular courses. I can just see us here at Wisconsin coming along with the brightest of all students who's one hour short of having his work in honors so that he would be called an honor graduate. You know what some faculties will be like. "Oh, no; oh, no. He didn't have that hour. He'll have to come back next semester and get that other hour in honors if he wants to be an honors graduate."

There is a tendency to select for honors courses bright young professors, and this in itself may be a danger. At the beginning of their careers, most younger members of our staffs are remarkable conformists. They want to be recognized, to achieve, to gain advancement in rank and salary. Their years of conformity as graduate students have prepared them for a type of acquiescence to academic customs and traditions that bring rewards in a faculty community. They will, of course, resist and oppose the dean and other administrative officers, especially in public—but this, too, I submit, is a kind of conformity, if not downright adolescence.

Young instructors, bright though they may be, may bring to honors courses nothing more than an enthusiasm for the chance to know bright students, to be friendly, and to enter into dialogues with them. Their endorsement of honors work itself may be a type of conformity to the responses of their faculty colleagues. Underneath their eagerness to be identified as honors course instructors, they may well be the strongest upholders of traditional patterns and procedures of college study. They may find it difficult to reject, for example, the image of the college student that they, yesterday, helped to perpetuate.

Such are a few of the pitfalls that I see. I mention these just because I wanted to get my aggressions out of my system—and because as we work along I think it's well for us to be advised about what is before us.

Conference Reflections

J. W. Maucker

President, Iowa State College

(Mr. Maucker was asked to make some extemporaneous observations on some of the issues raised during the first portion of the conference. The comments below are from the verbatim transcript of conference proceedings.)

Honors for Elementary Education Majors

The dilemma in providing honors for prospective elementary teachers is that, by virtue of the extreme breadth thought necessary in their programs, it is difficult for them to push far enough into any one subject to get to the level which seems appropriate for honors work. It is a real problem to figure out how to do this in a 4-year program. The suggestion of a major in the first 4 years and then an internship assumes a 5-year program; but we are just coming out of the woods on 1- and 2-year programs in many States. We must recognize that that's where we shall be for a while, although there is a good chance that we shall move on to 5-year programs in time.

We are, therefore, challenged to develop a 4-year program with the necessary breadth and still secure adequate depth for the honors student. It can be done. You see to it that the teacher (1) can handle instruction in reading, (2) has at least a minimum essential background in the social sciences, humanities, natural sciences and mathematics, and (3) has a concentration in a specific subject field built on top of the introductory courses. This probably could not be a full major in every case, but it could certainly be at least a strong minor. The extremely bright students could, however, elect enough courses so as to get, for all practical purposes, the equivalent of a straight liberal arts major of the kind that a secondary teacher takes. It may be made up of a somewhat different collection of courses in a given field, with some eye to the elementary teaching task; but it could have the depth necessary to qualify as a full-fledged, respectable major. This would be easier to do for those students who come to college prepared to exempt some beginning courses.

Bright students could then get into departmental as well as general honors. If there were honors courses in the professional education field, there would then be a full gamut of honors opportunities for elementary majors.

Honors in Practice Teaching

This leads me to Mr. Strong's question about honors work in practice teaching.[1] When we try to provide a tutorial kind of experience in which the student teacher is assigned to a very competent supervising teacher, possibly in a laboratory school, more likely in a public school system, we are aiming at exactly the kind of situation that Mr. Strong talked about—one where the approach is analytical and there is a concern as to what content and approach will be most appropriate. Method of inquiry and the attempt to evaluate results critically can most certainly be involved. If we are going to hand out some kind of accolade to those who have done honors work, the people who have done a really outstanding job in such student teaching or in the internship might very well be so recognized, without necessarily having to label the experience as an honors course.

---

[1] "Guidelines for Preparation Programs of Teachers of Secondary School Science and Mathematics. Recommendations of the Teacher Preparation-Certification Study of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification and the American Association for the Advancement of Science," September 1961.

Certification

The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification is working with John Mayor of the AAAS in some studies on improving teacher certification requirements in the fields of mathematics and sciences. This national association is a channel for working out the problems of honors programs and certification. It ought to be informed on the need to modify interpretations of various certification laws to take into account the needs of honors programs. For example, it ought to be possible to obtain certification for a person who does not quite meet the requirements but has had in an honors program what, in the judgment of the institution, is actually a superior preparation for teaching. The so-called "Approved Programs Approach" is a way of doing this.

I am sure that the certification people would want you to know that they have themselves led quite a drive through NASDTEC to get away from the credit-counting and straightjacketing influence on teacher education that many of them also deplore. What they are trying to move toward is a situation in which a State department of public instruction will say to any college that prepares teachers: "You work up the program that you consider will turn out a good teacher. We will take a look at it and, if we are convinced that it is a worthwhile program and meets certain broad minimum requirements, we will certify a person on your recommendation without looking at his transcript." This is the way it works, for example, in our State of Iowa, and I am sure it does in other States.

Financial Support for Education

You might consider the question of financial support irrelevant in a discussion of honors. Yet as we try to attract students into honors programs in teacher education, there is going to be difficulty unless we can give them fair assurance that in the schools they will have the kinds of working conditions that make it possible to carry on at an intellectual level consistent with honors work. Some professors say they just can't honestly recommend that students go on into high school or elementary teaching because they are going to be frustrated, they are going to have too great a load, are not going to have the necessary materials to work with, are not going to be allowed freedom, and so on. To the extent that this is true, a group of this kind, if it is sincerely interested in honors and wants honors programs to be operative in and to have an effect upon elementary and secondary school teaching, ought to take cognizance of how to get the conditions in the schools that will make this possible. I suggest to you that one of the main things is simply the question of whether or not we in this country are going to support our schools in such a way and to such an extent that there can be the right kind of working conditions for really excellent teaching and learning. Granted adequate support, the way would then be paved for the kind of honors programs in which we are interested.

The fact is, however, that we do not make ourselves in this Nation invest enough in education. It is true that expenditures for education have more than doubled in the last 10 years. But actually we have not increased the proportion of our gross national product per pupil in that time. We are spending about 3.5 percent of our gross national product on formal education at all levels—elementary, secondary, higher education, public and private. This is up about half a percent in the last 10 years, but enrollments have risen equal to that. Thus the proportion of our resources per pupil that we are investing in education has not increased. We had better recognize that we are talking through our hats when we talk about real excellence in the schools and the kind of thing we envision when we become most rhapsodic about honors programs, unless we are willing to invest a considerably greater amount than we do now. We ought to *double* our national investment in education.

It would be my guess that we're not going to do a really better qualitative job until we recognize this squarely. I would suggest that a group such as this might have some influence since it would be thought not to have quite so obvious an axe to grind as do a group of administrators who are always running with their hats in their hands trying to get money. There is a moral obligation on the part of scholars to speak out if they find, as I think you have, that their dreams of increased excellence through a particular kind of program, in this case the honors program, are frustrated by lack of adequate support to bring about the kinds of conditions which will make them realities. Until we educators and scholars recognize the relationship between support for the schools and excellence, we can't very well expect the public to see the relationship. And unless and until they see that relationship, they will not increase the investment in education.

Evaluation

Research in the field of teacher education is full of studies of opinion. We call them studies, but they are just opinion polls. People try this or that. Then some "researcher" writes around and asks them whether they think it was a good idea or not, i.e., how they *feel* about it. Or they may ask, how should honors programs be set up, or who should do the advising, or whatever it is. They count heads and if they find that more say "x" than "y", then "x" becomes the recommended procedure. In most cases, we have pitifully little evidence that a particular procedure is better than another. This is characteristic of teacher education at the present time; but I would hope that honors programs, which put scholarship and a search for evidence and the method of inquiry at the very pinnacle, would be characterized by much more careful search for evidence based on results obtained, not just on how people feel about their procedure. This would be a tremendous contribution in itself, but, as Dean Stiles says also, you've got to go beyond the question of whether or not the students taking honors work in college make good grades on tests or in some other way impress their professors.

In honors work for teacher education, we are challenged to be able to demonstrate in some way or other that honors make a difference in teaching. This really is difficult. We have to admit that we've done very little hard-headed research on the criteria of competence in teaching. We need to study what is learned by children, comparing those taught by teachers who have had the experience of honors work and those who have not had this experience. We must recognize that it isn't enough just to show that the teacher who had honors did a good job.

What must be demonstrated is that honors teachers do better jobs than comparable teachers who did not have the honors work. If you siphon off the very cream of the crop and give them honors programs, they are going to be capable but they would naturally have been capable in the traditional program as well. The challenge is to find out whether or not in actual fact this experience led them to perform more capably than comparable people without this particular experience. I would hope that this would be recognized as one of the obligations of the persons sincerely interested in honors work.

Conference Follow-up

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, of which I am president this year, is a good vehicle for presenting the idea of honors programs to the profession. The institutions that belong to AACTE prepare most of the teachers in this country. So if there should be honors experiences for prospective teachers, then we have a responsibility to take a good hard look at this and see if we cannot work it in as part of the AACTE program.

Appendix B. On Honors in Practice Teaching

Mr. Strong's statement that he himself did not see how the honors approach could be applied to student teaching was immediately challenged in the discussion following his address. The debate continued throughout the conference, and the following verbatim report presents some of the significant observations on the nature of honors work and suggestions for procedures in honors teaching. (See appendix C for identification of participants.)

Mr. Richardson (Ohio State) began the debate with the pointed question "Would Mr. Strong exclude the fine arts from an honors program?"

Strong (California): Fine arts, music—no, of course not. I see how the question is loaded. In any properly organized department of fine arts there are three kinds of courses: (1) Courses in art history taught by art historians; (2) courses in the understanding or appreciation of art; and (3) courses in painting. I find myself at a loss to see how this third kind of course would be in an honors program as such. I would expect very able students to be in this course, and in a way you might identify creativity of these students. There are students, of course, with a flair for handling materials who are not scholars. A great mistake we make in any department of art or music is not to have the creative activity being practiced by the students so that they get some idea out of the experience, but I do not consider this to be something *substantive*. It is part of the *experience*. So I answer your question by saying, in the way I have already answered with regard to education, there are two tasks which fall within and the third that falls without.

Smith (Minnesota): While we have excluded from our definition of honors the performance aspect of teaching or of art or of music, we still have the question: What constitutes excellence in the arts? There are some students who attain the highest level of excellence in the creative sense, but are not able to perform at the same level of excellence in art history and art criticism. Are we going to limit our definition of honors work, then, to the kind of work that is recognized traditionally as academic excellence? Or are we going to try to give some kind of recognition to excellence in artistic creation? What are we going to do with the highly creative artist who simply will not fit into the traditionally defined honors program, yet certainly belongs in the honors category in some way?

Strong: If you're talking about the virtuoso, the performing artist, I'm not entirely sure that that individual is best spending his time in the college or university. Perhaps he ought to be in art school or a conservatory of music. In other words, in the university we treat practice as a part of the experience that goes along with appreciation, with history, and so on.

Let me give you an example of the distinction I want to make here. In some institutions there are courses given in stenography and typewriting. More and more these courses are now given in commercial schools rather than in the college or the university, but when I was an undergraduate there was a department of commerce which eventually became a school of business administration, where a student took for credit a course in operating a typewriter. When I went to the university, my father laid down two requirements that I had to meet as a condition of getting support: One was that I learn to operate a typewriter, and the other was that I didn't go into law. (He was a lawyer.)

I wanted to learn to operate a typewriter, and the easiest way to do that was to take a course under an expert. I could have taken a course in the college of commerce. The credit, however, would not apply to the bachelor of arts degree. But I could also take a typing course in the department of psychology!—a course in learning. I'll tell you why the professor gave the course: He was an expert in learning theory and was convinced that the college of commerce was engaged in a time-wasting, inefficient method of teaching typewriting. He went over there and said, "Won't you set aside some of your students so that I can work with them? I would like to test this method which I think is a much more efficient one for acquiring a skill over against your outmoded and inefficient approach." They said, "No."

As a result, at his next class in learning he said, "I want each of you to have access to a typewriter after one month." I took that course. We started reading about learning. Then he divided the class, half doing it one way, and half another. He was, of course, getting research out of this and we were learning to type. I also learned a lot about learning, not from hitting the typewriter, but from doing that in connection with the study of learning. A course like that is entirely qualified for an honors program if it is set up with very superior students interested in psychology. But as for a course in training to be skillful in hitting the keys, if it were just that, it would not be a course for an honors program.

Now you may say, "The difference is great between working on a canvas and hitting typewriter keys—one is creative and the other mechanical." I don't think that the difference is sufficient to bring painting itself into an honors program.

Richardson: We don't want to see practice teaching equated with skills in typewriting. We like to think of student teaching as being a point at which there is creativity, at which there is growth, indeed at which philosophy—the philosophy of education—becomes the substance. It is at this point that some of us, at least, are disturbed by your willingness to write this off and say that here there is no place for honors.

Stiles (Wisconsin): Related to this I should like to ask if there is not a danger that if we separate the practice of teaching from honors we shall have honors graduates who nonetheless are poor teachers. Perhaps Mr. Jarrett would like to talk on that since he spoke of other dangers.

Jarrett (Western Washington): I do not doubt that this is a danger. It is one I suppose that we confront under any circumstance, and indeed it happens all the time, honors program or no honors program. The principal import of the question is that, whenever we develop an honors program within a teacher preparation program, we must be careful not to neglect the more practical aspects. We must not content ourselves with mere brilliant theorizing about education and suppose that it can replace the homelier, and perhaps finally more important, tasks of learning how to teach. Theory and practice should go together. I would think of it not merely as a utilization of practice in the field of theory, but I would want to argue that there is the return passage, too. There is a sense in which some of the most exciting ideas might actually be engendered in practice and, being witnessed by a supervisor, be brought back into the discussion for analysis by the students who are able to handle that level of sophistication.

Shepard (Michigan State): Mr. Strong, what are your reasons for not regarding courses in practice teaching as appropriate for honors?

Strong: Any skill or any art of practice is something that can be taught. It can be taught in part by example. It can be taught by watching another perform and indicating where he is not doing the job well. It is subject to analysis. Thus the way you learn to teach is by teaching, but you do this much more effectively under supervision with criticism and analysis going on. In this sense I wasn't saying for a moment that this isn't work that is worth doing. I am, however, talking about the composition of study that in my conception makes up an honors program. I am setting off that which has to do with coaching for a skill (and there is no more important skill than teaching) from substantive study where you are concerned with the inquiry into ideas. If I were asked to say what the content is of an honors course I would say it is inquiry into ideas. If you show me that what is involved in learning to teach is an inquiry into a body of ideas which has a literature, which has a fund of something that can be analyzed, then you've captured me. But until you've shown me that, I still must raise the question.

Jarrett: I'm a little bit disturbed by Mr. Strong's sharp distinction here between theory and practice. If a good student teaching program is always accompanied by work in theory, for instance by a seminar in learning theory, perhaps in the methodology of a subject matter or even a more generalized methodology, I don't see why it would not be possible to use the actual performance of students in the field as the basis for a kind of substantive criticism. It would utilize the theories that were being engendered in the seminar in such a way as to carry out a distinctively different program—the criticism of practice. This could be as exciting and as involved with ideas as anything you would find in the pure theory taken just as such. I don't see why this shouldn't in fact be done. I don't say that it's commonly done; I think it's relatively unusual. This will not, of course, replace the individualized coaching or supervision, but that has its parallel with the tutorial aspects of other kinds of honors programs. Even at the level of the seminar that accompanies the student teaching there could be engendered an intimate relationship between theory and practice that would be an inherent part of a well-developed honors program in professional education.

Strong: I couldn't agree more. That's just my point. If you have an inquiry where practice is the confirmation of a theory or a hypothesis, then you have given practice a substantive content. Where your practice is art and the experience you gain gives you an understanding of principles of composition, then the two are not isolated. But if practice is separated off by itself without this relation to the theory or ideas involved, then it lacks the necessary ingredient for an honors approach. In this sense nothing that comes within the purview of work in the school of education need fall outside of honors. I tried to say that when I said that in developing your honors program, if you set aside the training task as a special category, nevertheless that task can be enlivened, can gain a significance, if it relates to what is being done in the theoretical studies. Practice can provide the evidence for testing hypotheses, for showing a cliché for what it is—just a chiché. When you are devising an honors program you must always see that the student is intellectually engaged. If he is a very bright student and if you don't engage him intellectually, you're going to bore him, and if you bore him you're going to lose him.

Cohen (ICSS): Does your position apply to the widely held view in our culture that in the approach to the arts you must not contaminate creativity with talk?

Strong: Yes, that's right, because no amount of discourse about art communicates what the painting itself communicates. Therefore you don't convey in words what the painting conveys. But how to look at a picture is a subject for an honors course; painting a picture as such is not.

Borrowman (Wisconsin): This does not fit our way of viewing things. We would like to think that we can ask the professors responsible for any aspect of the education of teachers—whether it be the liberal arts aspect, the history and philosophy of education, educational psychology or the supervised experience—to conceive challenging, stimulating, and distinctive ways of handling bright students in those particular fields. It seems quite clear to us that the type of thing that would be done in a methods course or in a supervised field experience would certainly be quite different from that appropriate to a course in history itself. If one wants to define honors as involving the kinds of activities that are provided in a course in history, then I would be willing to agree with Mr. Strong that you can't have honors in the applied fields. On the other hand, we would like to think that there are ways of handling gifted students in the applied fields. We rather hope that the professors who are responsible for supervising the internship programs or the apprenticeship system will find activities that are appropriate to bright students working in those areas and different from those that are appropriate to less talented people. We are inclined to think that if students in these areas do an unusually fine job that really challenges and excites them, we ought to recognize them. We are, therefore, going to call distinguished and imaginative work in teaching honors and give credit for it. We hope that the standard common to all honors will be based on the quality of the challenge.

Strong: The point that I am still puzzled about is to see how one would gather together a group of superior students in an honors colloquium or honors course where one is concerned with method in relation to practice teaching. A number of you have pounced on me for being obtuse, or being too puristic, or being too much in letters and science and not having enough vision. So here's my question: some of you have honors programs in departments or schools of education. I have not yet heard from any of you just what constitutes your honors course or your honors colloquium in supervised teaching. In specific terms, what is the honors work that you do, if you do it, in those courses?

Stiles: I think it's only fair to say that the reason you haven't gotten an answer is because we don't have one.

Clayton (Syracuse): We're not yet doing it, Mr. Strong, but we're currently working on it. This has been our planning year for a special program in which four universities in upstate New York—Cornell, Syracuse, Rochester, and Buffalo

—are working together on a new program for superior teachers. The practical phase of the program will include an internship experience in the senior year, in which the students will do full-time teaching for one semester in a public school. These public schools are carefully selected to see that they are places in which change is going on, where especially the method of inquiry is a fundamental part of the teaching. We are selecting specific teachers in these schools to work with these superior students and potential leaders. We hope that this experience with selected teachers in selected schools, in a carefully designed, cooperative and carefully thought-through program will have the quality of honors work in the practical situation. We hope that we can find some evidence that the people who go into this program are potential leaders in teaching. It seems to me that, when you get the best students working in the best schools with the best teachers in the best programs we can devise, this is honors quality.

Marsh (Illinois): I can conceive of an approach in which an honors student might study the history of the various teaching techniques from those of Confucius and Buddha on down, and then try out these various procedures. He would seek to find out under what circumstances certain techniques work and when a shift to a different technique is needed in order to adapt to the needs of the group and the circumstances. Of course, this would be a difficult thing to do, but couldn't it be done as honors work in teacher training? It could include both practice and method in an historical, philosophical, experimental orientation, and would be quite a fascinating thing.

Drummond (New Mexico): Admittedly, a course in any field can be a miserable experience for a bright student if the teacher is a miserable teacher; but it ought to be possible, with the right teacher, to make any subject into an honors experience. Mr. Strong has challenged us to show how to do this in student teaching.

We tried this 2 or 3 years ago at George Peabody College when I was there. We said to a bright girl in elementary education, "We think you are brighter and have more promise as a teacher than most of our students, and that you can become a full-time classroom teacher in a shorter period of time. Instead of 12 weeks as a regular student teacher, we expect that somewhere between the sixth and eighth week you ought to be able to handle a class on your own with full confidence in your ability and competence to do what you expect to do. So we intend to use the last several weeks of the quarter in a different way for you. We want to extend your learning possibilities."

After 8 weeks she did get up to the level we anticipated. She then spent a week as a principal's intern, learning the problems that came into his office. She spent a week with the teacher at the grade below the grade level which she was to teach and a week with the teacher at the grade level above. She went to the junior high school and spent a week there, seeing the problems in terms of articulation between the elementary and the junior high school years.

It might have been wise, after she had spent 6, 7 or 8 weeks with a very good teacher, to have put her in a classroom for a week with an ineffectual teacher and asked her to think about the difference. This might be a fascinating way of providing an undergraduate thesis subject for honors majors in elementary education.

Fitzgerald (Boston College): As another example, at Boston College we have an arrangement which brings practice teaching into the ordinary collegiate undergraduate honors experience. We bring together the sophomore and senior honors groups in a general colloquium on the problems of education. The seniors act as guides or tutors for the sophomores and conduct the colloquium.

Wynn (New Mexico) : I do not think the conference has settled this issue to anyone's satisfaction. The argument was bound to end inconclusively. At a brief conference so crowded with other problems, we could hardly expect to resolve the broad issue raised by Mr. Strong: What is or is not intrinsic to an honors approach, whether in the liberal arts, in professional education, in other professional fields, or in the performing arts? Nor could we do justice to the profound implications for teaching and learning. These were given early attention in many of John Dewey's writings on the role of experience in rational and expressive development. A. N. Whitehead coped with them. They have been more recently raised by Jerome Bruner's report in *The Process of Education* and Nevitt Sanford's *The American College*.

We in honors must, in time, however, cope with them all—with the relations between creativity and intelligence; between the intuitive and the analytical; between knowing, feeling and doing; and between being and meaning.

Appendix C. Conference Participants and Executive Committee and Staff of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student

Hosts for the University of Wisconsin

Fred H. Harrington, *Vice President* for Academic Affairs

Lindley Stiles, *Dean, School of Education*

Terrence J. Snowden, *Assistant to Dean of School of Education*

School of Education Honors Committee: Merle L. Borrowman (Education), Chairman; R. H. Bing (Mathematics); Samuel Burns (Music); Frances Cumbee (Education); Merle Curti (History); Murray Fowler (Classics); Harry Harlow (Psychology); Herbert Klausmeier (Education); Fred M. Logan (Art Education); R. Rollefson (Physics); John W. Rothney (Education); James S. Watrous (Art History); Helen C. White (English); and Alvin Whitley (English), Chairman of College of Arts and Sciences Honors Committee

Representatives and Invited Participants*

Henry L. Adams (*Psychology*), *Chairman, Honors Board, Western Washington State College*

Charles M. Allen (*Education*), *Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois*

Wallace L. Anderson (*English*), *State College of Iowa*

Charles E. Bish, *Director, Project on the Academically Talented Student, National Education Association*

Clifford L. Bishop (*Education*), *State College of Iowa*

Merle L. Borrowman (*Education*), *Chairman, Committee, Honors Program for Gifted Students Preparing for Teaching, University of Wisconsin*

J Ned Bryan, *Specialist, Gifted and Talented Students, U.S. Office of Education*

Warner O. Chapman (*Government*), *Director, Honors Program, Indiana University*

---

*Although not represented, the following organizations have expressed support for the aims of this conference: American Council on Education, Association for Higher Education, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, American Association for the Advancement of Science, and American Council of Learned Societies.

THOMAS E. CLAYTON *(Education), Syracuse University*

FRANK O. COPLEY *(Classics), Director of Admissions with Advanced Standing and Consultant to High Schools in the Honors Program, University of Michigan*

THEODORE S. CURRIER *(History), Chairman, Honors Program, Fisk University*

BYRON DOENGES *(Economics), Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Indiana University*

HAROLD D. DRUMMOND *(Elementary Education), University of New Mexico*

PAUL W. EBERMAN, *Associate Dean, School of Education, University of Wisconsin*

JOHN S. EELLS, JR. *(English), Chairman, Honors Council, Winthrop College*

A. MARTIN ELDERSVELD, *Dean of Instructional Affairs, Grand Rapids Junior College; Observer for American Association of Junior Colleges*

FRANK ENDICOTT, *Education Department, Northwestern University, Vice Chairman of the Commission on Research Service; Member of Committee on the Superior and Talented Student Project, North Central Association*

SAMUEL EVERETT *(Education), City College, New York*

JEROME A. FALLON *(Communication Arts), Associate Dean and Director, Honors Program, Ball State Teachers College*

LEO C. FAY *(Education), Indiana University*

REV. WILLIAM E. FITZGERALD, S.J. *(Philosophy). Director, Honors Program, School of Education, Boston College*

OTTO GRAF *(German), Director, Honors Council, College of Literature, Science and the Arts, University of Michigan*

RAOUL R. HAAS, *Director, Student Personnel Services, Chicago Teachers College North*

WILLIAM J. HAGGERTY, *President, State University of New York, College of Education at New Paltz*

MARGARET HAGLER *(English), Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh*

OSCAR M. HAUGH *(Education), University of Kansas*

KENNETH B. HENDERSON *(Education), Chairman, College of Education Honors Council, University of Illinois*

FRANK M. HIMMELMANN *(Education), Associate Dean, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.*

R. LYNN HUTCHINSON *(Biology), Program Coordinator, Southern Connecticut State College*

JAMES L. JARRETT *(Philosophy), President, Western Washington State College*

ROBERT E. JOHNSON *(Physiology), ICSS Executive Committee; Director, University Honors Program, University of Illinois*

ROBERT R. KADESCH *(Physics), University of Utah*

CHARLES R. KELLER, *Director, John Hay Fellows Program, New York*

GORDON C. LEE *(Education), University of Washington*

CHARLES F. LEHMANN *(Education), Assistant Dean, University of Michigan*

EMIL LUCKI *(History), Director, Honors Program, University of Utah*

RICHARD R. MARSH *(Food Technology), Assistant Director, University Honors Programs, University of Illinois*

J. W. MAUCKER, *President, State College of Iowa; President, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education*

REUBEN R. MCDANIEL *(Mathematics), Director of Honors, Arts and Sciences, Virginia State College*

RALPH N. MILLER *(English), Chairman, Committee on Honors Programs, Western Michigan University*

VERA MOSS (*English*), *Chairman, Committee on Honors Program, Wisconsin State College, River Falls*

HERBERT B. NEWMAN (*Education*), *Brooklyn College*

JOE PARK (*Education*), *Chairman, All-University Committee on Honors, Northwestern University*

THOMAS W. PARKER, *University of Arizona*

ISABEL PEARD (*Education*), *Member, School of Education Honors Committee, Cornell University*

LEWIS N. PINO, *Program Director, Undergraduate Science Education, National Science Foundation*

HENRY C. REIFSNYDER (*English*), *Chairman, College Honors Program, Indiana State College, Indiana*

JOHN S. RICHARDSON, *Ohio State University*

ROY A. RIGGS (*Languages*), *Director, Honors Program, Nebraska State Teachers College*

JAMES H. ROBERTSON (*English*), *ICSS Executive Committee; Associate Dean, College of Literature, Science and the Arts, University of Michigan*

WESLEY ROEHM (*History*), *Oak Park High School, Oak Park, Illinois*

ROBERT T. ROELOFS (*Philosophy*), *Chairman, University Committee on Honors Studies, University of Nevada*

STEPHEN ROMINE (*Education*), *Dean, School of Education, University of Colorado*

THEODORE SANDS (*Social Science*), *Coordinator, Programs for the Gifted, Illinois State Normal University*

JOHN SCHMID (*Education*), *University of Arkansas*

LORAINE V. SHEPARD (*Education*), *Honors College Advisor and Member, All-University Honors College Committee, Michigan State University*

DONALD E. SHIPP, JR. (*Education*), *Louisiana State University*

DONALD K. SMITH (*Speech and Theater Arts*), *University of Minnesota*

ELI SOBEL (*Germanic Languages*), *Associate Dean, College of Letters and Science and Adviser, Gifted Student Program, University of California, Los Angeles*

HOWARD A. STROBEL (*Chemistry*), *Assistant Dean, Trinity College, Duke University*

EDWARD W. STRONG (*Philosophy*), *ICSS Executive Committee; Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley*

CATHERINE F. TITUS (*English*), *Director, Honors Program, Central Missouri State College*

GEORGE R. WAGGONER (*English*), *ICSS Executive Committee; Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Kansas*

MARSHALL D. WATTLES (*Economics*), *Director, Honors College, University of Oregon*

HERMAN WEIL (*Psychology*), *Chairman, Honors Committee, University of Wisconsin*

WALTER D. WEIR (*Philosophy*), *ICSS Executive Committee; Director of Honors, University of Colorado*

ALVIN WHITLEY (*English*), *Chairman, College of Arts and Sciences Honors Committee, University of Wisconsin*

DUDLEY WYNN (*English*), *ICSS Executive Committee; Director of General Honors, University of New Mexico*

JOHN J. ZIMMERMAN (*Social Science*), *Chairman, Honors Program, Kansas State Teachers College*

ICSS Staff and Executive Committee

Joseph W. Cohen (*Philosophy*), *Director*
Norman D. Kurland (*History*), *Associate Director*
Linnie W. Schafer, *Secretary*
Executive Committee:
  E. A. Cameron, *University of North Carolina*
  J. H. Franklin, *Brooklyn College*
  R. E. Johnson, *University of Illinois*
  R. B. MacLeod, *Cornell University*
  Margaret Mead, *American Museum of Natural History*
  H. H. Quint, *University of Massachusetts*
  J. H. Robertson, *University of Michigan*
  E. W. Strong, *University of California*
  C. G. Taylor, *Louisiana State University*
  G. R. Waggoner, *University of Kansas*
  W. D. Weir, *University of Colorado*
  Dudley Wynn, *University of New Mexico*

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1960 O—213-761

New Dimensions in Higher Education

Previous numbers of the New Dimensions in Higher Education series which are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.:

1. *Independent Study*, by Winslow R. Hatch and Ann Bennet. 1960. 36pp. 25¢
2. *Effectiveness in Teaching*, by Winslow R. Hatch and Ann Bennett. 1960. 28pp. 20¢
3. *The Experimental College*, by Winslow R. Hatch. 1960. 13 pp. 15¢
4. *Impact of College*, by Mervin B. Freedman. 1960. 27 pp. 15¢
5. *Management of Learning*, by E. D. Duryea. 1960. 37 pp. 20¢
6. *Study Abroad*, by Irwin Abrams. 1960. 21 pp. 15¢
7. *Quest for Quality*, by Samuel Baskin. 1960. 18 pp. 15¢
8. *Advanced Standing*, by Shirley A. Radcliffe. 1961. 24 pp. 15¢
9. *The Credit System in Colleges and Universities*, by Lanora G. Lewis. 1961. 37 pp. 20¢
10. *Flexibility in the Undergraduate Curriculum*, by Charles C. Cole, Jr., and Lanora G. Lewis. 1962. 57 pp. 35¢